

THE COMMUNIST

VOL. VII

MARCH, 1928

NO. 3



IN THIS ISSUE

America and Russia . . . *Marx and Engels*
Ruthenberg as Fighter and Leader

—*Jay Lovestone*

After the Canton Uprising . . . *John Pepper*

Atheism and Evolution . . . *Bertram D. Wolfe*

The Proletariat and War . . . *V. I. Lenin*

Marx, Lenin and the Commune

—*Alexander Trachtenberg*

Capitalist Efficiency Socialism . . . *Wm. Z. Foster*

Save the Miners' Union Call

Literature and Economics . . . *V. F. Calverton*

PRICE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED 25 cents

WRECKING THE LABOR BANKS

By

WM. Z. FOSTER

A snap-shot of the reactionary labor officialdom in an orgy of looting the treasury of the B. of L. E.

25 CENTS



STALIN'S INTERVIEW



with the FIRST AMERICAN
TRADE UNION DELEGA-
TION TO SOVIET RUSSIA

*Questions and Answers to
American Trade Unionists*

25 CENTS

5 COPIES FOR \$1.00

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
39 East 125th Street New York, N. Y.

The COMMUNIST

*A Theoretical Magazine for the Discussion of
Revolutionary Problems*

Published for the Workers (Communist) Party of America

BERTRAM D. WOLFE, *Editor*

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York,
N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1890. 

VOL. VII

MARCH, 1928

No. 3

Table of Contents

AMERICA AND RUSSIA	131
MARX AND ENGELS	
MARX, LENIN AND THE COMMUNE	133
ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG	
THE PROLETARIAT AND WAR	141
V. I. LENIN	
RUTHENBERG AS FIGHTER AND LEADER	145
JAY LOVESTONE	
AFTER THE CANTON UPRISING	154
JOHN PEPPER	
ATHEISM AND EVOLUTION	160
BERTRAM D. WOLFE	
CAPITALIST EFFICIENCY "SOCIALISM"	169
WM. Z. FOSTER	
SAVE THE MINERS' UNION CALL	175
LITERATURE AND ECONOMICS	181
V. F. CALVERTON	
BOOK REVIEWS	190

Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to: THE COMMUNIST,
43 East 125th St., New York. Subscription rates \$2.00 a year; \$1.25 for six months;
foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

B. CARLIN, *Business Manager.*



FRIEDRICH ENGELS



KARL MARX

America and Russia

By MARX and ENGELS

(A hitherto untranslated introduction to the Communist Manifesto.)

[The present year marks the eightieth anniversary of the revolution of 1848, and of the platform of the Communists for that revolution—the Communist Manifesto.

No less important than the Manifesto are the various introductions to it, such as the famous one written by Marx and Engels in 1872 which modified the Manifesto in the light of the experiences of the Paris Commune.

In commemoration of the eightieth anniversary we introduce American Marxists to what we believe is the first English translation of the introduction to the Second Russian edition written in 1882. It is for us the most interesting and important for the reason that it deals with the two countries that have become the political poles of the earth today, America and Russia.

It is especially interesting to note that as far back as 1882, Marx and Engels were already able to see that “Russia forms the vanguard of Europe’s revolutionary movement” and that it was not unlikely that the Russian revolution might “become the signal for a workers’ revolution in the West.” The two revolutionists, Marx and Engels, could foresee that in 1882, Messrs. Kautsky, Bauer and Co. couldn’t see it when it actually came to pass under their counter-revolutionary noses. Morris Hillquit “celebrated” the eightieth anniversary of the Communist Manifesto by declaring at a banquet in New York that “the Russian revolution of November, 1917, was the greatest calamity that had ever befallen the international Socialist movement.”

The introduction given below was written by Marx and Engels for the Russian edition of 1882 and retranslated by Engels into German in 1890. It has been translated for THE COMMUNIST from the German edition of 1898 by Elizabeth Brissenden Miller.—B. D. W.]

THE FIRST Russian edition of the “Manifesto of the Communist Party,” Bakunin’s translation, appeared at the beginning of the Sixties in the *Kolokol* printing-office. At that time a Russian edition of this work had for the West at most only the significance of a literary curiosity. Today such a conception is no longer possible. What a limited compass the range of the proletarian movement had at the time the *Manifesto* was first published (January, 1848) is best shown by the last chapter: “Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Opposition Parties.” Here are missing especially Russia and the United States. It was at the time when Russia formed the last great reserve of European reaction and when emigration to the United States absorbed the surplus forces of the European proletariat. Both countries supplied Europe with raw materials and served at the same time as markets for the sale of its industrial products. Both appeared, therefore, in one way or another, as supports of the European social order.

How all this has changed today! This very European emigration has made possible the colossal development of North-American agriculture, which by its competition shakes the large as well as the small land-holdings in Europe to their very foundations. It has at the same time

given the United States the possibility of tackling the exploitation of its abundant industrial resources, and indeed with such energy and on such a scale, that it must in a short time make an end to the industrial monopoly of Western Europe. And these two circumstances also react on America in a revolutionary direction. The small and medium-sized land-holdings of the independent working farmers, the foundation of America's whole political order, are undergoing more and more the competition of giant farms, while at the same time in the industrial districts a large proletarian class is being formed for the first time side by side with a fabulous concentration of capital.

Let us turn to Russia. At the time of the Revolution of 1848-49 not only the European monarchs but also the European bourgeoisie saw in Russian intervention the only salvation from the proletariat, which at that time was just beginning to become aware of its strength. They proclaimed the Czar the head of European reaction. Today he sits in Gatschina as a war prisoner of the Revolution, and Russia forms the vanguard of Europe's revolutionary movement.

The task of the *Communist Manifesto* was the proclamation of the inevitably impending downfall of the present bourgeois property system. In Russia, however, we find, side by side with the feverishly developing capitalist order and the bourgeois land-ownership system only now being formed, more than half of the land held by the peasants in communal ownership.

Now the question is: Can the Russian peasant-communes—a form of primitive communal ownership of the land to be sure already very much disorganized—pass over directly to a higher communist form of land-ownership or must it first go through the same dissolution process which is represented in the historic development of the West?

The only possible answer to this question today is the following:

If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a workers' revolution in the West, so that each supplements the other, then the present Russian communal ownership will be able to serve as the starting-point of a Communist development.

London, January 21, 1882.



PARIS
Monument aux victimes
de la Commune 1871

Monument commemorating
the Communards shot in 1871

MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE COMMUNARDS SHOT IN 1871

Marx, Lenin and the Commune

By ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG

On March 3, 1869, Marx wrote Kugelman that the revolutionary movement in France was gaining momentum and that "the Parisians are beginning seriously to study their recent revolutionary past and to get ready for the newly approaching revolutionary struggle." Lenin calls particular attention to Marx's ability to feel the pulse of the epoch, and foresee approaching revolutionary crises.

"Pedants of Marxism," writes Lenin, "believe this is ethical nonsense, romanticism, absence of realism. No, gentlemen, this is a union of theory and practice of the class struggle."

On December 13, 1870, Marx wrote Kugelman: "Whatever the outcome of the war, it has taught the French workers the use of arms, and this makes the future more hopeful." Three months before the Paris uprising Marx was already smelling powder, and foresaw the approaching crisis.

MARX WRITES KUGELMAN ON THE COMMUNE

The celebrated letter to Kugelman which Marx wrote on April 12, 1871, during the height of the Commune, and which Lenin considers the crowning letter of the entire collection begins:

"If you will turn to the last chapter of the 18th Brumaire you will see that according to my opinion the next revolutionary uprising in France will be an attempt to destroy the bureaucratic military machine instead of handing it over from one group to the other as was done previously. Such indeed is the preliminary condition of every genuinely popular revolution on the continent. This is exactly the attempt of our heroic Paris comrades. What dexterity, what historical initiative, what ability for self-sacrifice these Parisians display. After six months of starvation and destruction caused more by internal treachery than by the foreign enemy, they rise under Prussian bayonets as tho there was no war between France and Germany, as tho the enemy wasn't still at the gates of Paris. History records no such example of heroism. If they will be defeated it will be because of their 'magnanimity.' They should have immediately marched on Versailles, as soon as Viny and the reactionary portion of the Paris National Guard escaped from Paris. The opportune moment was missed on account of 'conscientiousness.' They did not want to start a civil war, as if the monstrosity Thiers hadn't already begun it with his attempt to disarm Paris."

Marx, the revolutionary strategist, knew that when the enemy of revolutionary Paris was on the run, it was the job of the National

Guard to pursue Thiers' defeated army until it was annihilated, rather than allow it time to reorganize its forces and return to fight the Paris workers. Remembering Plekhanov's famous admonition after the failure of the December, 1905 uprising in Moscow—"They shouldn't have resorted to arms"—Lenin recalls that Marx warned the Parisian workers in September, 1870, when the Blanquists were bent upon the overthrow of the bourgeois government against unprepared uprisings.

"But how did Marx act when what he warned against what took place in March, 1871? Has he used it against his opponents—the Blanquists and Proudhonists who were leading the Commune? Has he like a school ma'am kept on repeating: I told you so, I warned you. Here you have your romancing, your revolutionary dreams. Perhaps he criticized the Communards as Plekhanov did the December fighters with a self-satisfied philistine reproach: 'They shouldn't have resorted to arms?' Marx considered an uprising in September, 1870, as insanity. Seeing a mass uprising in April, 1871, he gave the full attention of a participant in the great occurrences, which marked a step forward in the historic revolutionary movement."

In the second part of his letter to Kugelman, Marx mentions another grave error in the early history of the Commune:

"The Central Committee (of the National Guard) relinquished its powers too soon to pass them on to the Commune. Again on account of 'honesty' carried to suspicion. Be it as it may, this Paris uprising, even if it will be suppressed by the wolves, swine and dirty dogs of the old order, is the most glorious achievement of our party since the June uprising. Compare these Parisians, ready to storm the heavens, with hangers-on of the German-Prussian holy Roman empire with its antediluvian masquerades, reeking with the smell of the barracks, church, junkerdom, and especially philistinism."

Here again Marx, the centralist, realized that a successful revolutionary struggle against Thiers could have been carried out by the Paris workers only under the leadership of a centralized revolutionary authority which had the military resources at its command. This centralized authority was then the Central Committee of the National Guard. By renouncing its powers and turning over its authority to the loosely organized Commune, the National Guard dissipated the revolutionary energy of its armed forces.

Five days later, April 17, Marx writes Kugelman again about the Commune. He takes issue with his friend who seemed to have compared the Paris rising to the protest demonstrations which took place in June, 1849, and which were of a petty bourgeois origin. Kugelman must have been questioning the wisdom of the

revolt and showed his scepticism regarding its outcome. "To create world history would be, of course, very easy if the struggle could be waged only under absolutely favorable circumstances," was Marx's caustic repartee.

He declared that in the case of of Commune "the decisive unfavorable circumstances must be sought, not in the general conditions of French society, but in the presence of Prussians at the very gates of Paris. This," he continued, "the bourgeois scoundrels of Versailles knew. That is why they put before the Parisians the alternative: either to accept the provoked struggle or to capitulate without a fight. The demoralization of the working class which would ensue as a result of the second instance would be a greater misfortune than the loss of any number of leaders. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class and the state representing its interests, has, thanks to the Paris Commune, entered a new phase. However it may end this time, a new landmark of universal historical significance has been achieved just the same."

This was precisely Lenin's attitude regarding the December uprising in Moscow in 1905. The revolutionists of Moscow who had the support of the masses either had to accept the provocation of the Czar's troops or go down in moral defeat before the Moscow workers. Though defeated, the revolutionists came out of that unequal struggle glorified by the entire working class of Russia.

While the panicky Mensheviks were mumbling the Plekhanov formula: "They should not have resorted to arms," Lenin saw in the heroic struggle of the Moscow workers the revolutionary will to conquer of the Russian working class as a whole.

Commenting on Marx's observation that the Paris workers had to take up the fight, Lenin wrote:

"Marx could appreciate that there were moments in history when a struggle of the masses, even in a hopeless cause, was necessary, for the sake of the future education of these masses and their training for the next struggle."

It was this hopeful view of the Paris uprising applied to the revolutionary struggle of 1905 that led Lenin to maintain in 1907 in his introduction to the Kugelmann letters: "The working class of Russia has already demonstrated once and will prove again that it is able to 'storm the heavens.'" And it did in 1917.

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION TRIUMPHS

The Commune existed only two months. During this time it showed, according to Engels, its class character in most of the

administrative acts. Among the social achievements of the Commune must be mentioned: the reorganization of the army to make it serve the interests of the Commune; the separation of the Church and State; removal of religious control over public education; abolition of night work in the bakeries; limitation of the payment of officials do not more than workers' wages; abolition of fines levied upon workers; and granting the workers the right to operate the shops and factories deserted or closed by their owners.

On the 40th anniversary of the Commune, Lenin wrote:

"In modern society the proletariat, enslaved by capital economically, cannot rule politically before breaking the chains which bind it to capital. This is why the Commune had to develop along socialist lines, that is, to attempt to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie, the rule of capital, the destruction of the very foundations of the present social order."

Cut off from the rest of the country, and having lost strategic opportunities at the beginning, the Communards were soon to fight for their very lives. Thiers reorganized his forces at Versailles. With the aid of soldiers hurriedly returned from the German camps and the benevolent attitude of the Prussian troops, he was able to marshall new forces and make war on Paris. Thiers' troops were permitted by the Prussians to concentrate around the city. From May 21 to 28 the city was subjected to a bombardment by the Versailles army. The Paris workers fought like lions. Fighting against odds the Commune fell amid ruin and destruction, brought by Thiers' avenging hordes. As a result of a week's fighting thousands lay prostrate in the streets, more thousands of captives were taken to the Pere-la-Chaise cemetery where they were slaughtered in groups and many more were exiled to penal colonies.

MARX'S EPIC ON THE COMMUNE

The blood of the Parisian workers, spilled in the course of proletarian emancipation hadn't dried when Marx read to the General Council of the First International, a paper which was destined to become one of the greatest pieces of political writing ever penned. Two days after the fall of the Commune, May 30, Marx read his famous "Address" entitled "The Civil War in France."

Marx wrote "The Civil War in France" to meet the attacks upon the Commune from the bourgeois and reformist ranks. In true Marx fashion he drew a picture of the forces which brought it about and hurled his invectives against the bourgeoisie and its agents. He knew that all crimes in existence would be charged against the Paris workers, just as the Bolsheviks were accused of

all crimes which could be conjured up by the morbid mind. He unmasked the enemies of the Commune before they had a chance to speak. He also had in mind the faint-hearted, the 'I told you so' revolutionists, when he analyzed the conditions under which the Commune had to work and glorified the heroism and revolutionary self-sacrifice of the proletarian workers of Paris.

"The Civil War in France" will forever remain a literary communist landmark because one sees in it not only Marx the theoretician, but also the tribune of the people, the fighter, the revolutionary strategist, the enthusiastic leader, the defender of his class.

MARX AND ENGELS ON THE STATE

"The Civil War in France" is a great revolutionary classic. The third part of it is particularly replete with passages which will always remain guideposts for the student and active worker in the Communist movement. It is here that we find analyzed the most important contribution of the Commune. At the very beginning of this section we come across the famous passage which was used the following year by Marx and Engels in an introduction to a new edition of the Communist Manifesto and which they considered as an important amendment of the Manifesto.

Marx asks: "What is the Commune, that sphinx so tantalizing to the bourgeois mind?" He answers by quoting from the proclamation of the Central Committee on March 18: "The proletarians of Paris, amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling class, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking over into their own hands the direction of public affairs. . . . They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power." Then follows Marx's historic comment: "*But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes.*" It was this theme and Marx's discussion of the origin and development of the bourgeois State which served Lenin as text for his "State and Revolution." Readers of that important study of the State, "the problem of all problems" according to Bukharin, will find profuse quotations from this part of "The Civil War in France." It should be remembered that already on April 12th, in his letter to Kugelman, Marx spoke about "the destruction of the bureaucratic political machine," as a prerequisite of a real popular revolution.

In 1891, the 20th anniversary of the Commune, Engels wrote an introduction to a new German edition of "The Civil War in

France.” (The available English translation of the pamphlet has only part of that introduction. The reason for the omission of the second part is not given. Whether his omission was an act of vandalism or of ignorance, the writer is not prepared at present to venture an opinion.) In criticising the Commune for not taking over the Bank of France and using it for its own advantage, Engels points out that the Commune tried to utilize the old government apparatus. He comes back to what Marx took up in his “Address” by asserting that “the Commune should have recognized that the workers, having assumed power, cannot rule with the old State power, the machinery used before for its own exploitation.” Engels concludes:

“In truth, the State is nothing but an apparatus for the oppression of one class by another, in a democratic republic not less than in a monarchy.”

Marx analyzed the nature of the capitalist state thus:

“At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified the class antagonism between capital and labor, the State power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labor, a public force organized for social enslavement, an engine of class despotism. After every revolution, marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of the State power stands out in bolder and bolder relief.”

Again, after analyzing the results of the various revolutions from 1830 to 1871, Marx concludes on the nature of the capitalist State: “Democracy is, at the same time, the most prostitute and the ultimate form of the State which nascent middle-class society had commenced to elaborate as a means of its own emancipation from feudalism, and which full-grown bourgeois society had finally transformed into a means for the enslavement of labor by capital.” The Commune, according to Marx, “was not only to supersede the monarchical form of class rule, but class rule itself.” The different measures of the Commune were aimed at the very foundations of bourgeois rule. It was “to serve as a lever for uprooting the economical foundations upon which rests the existence of classes and therefore class rule. With labor emancipated, every man becomes a working man and productive labor ceases to be a class attribute.” Marx saw in the Commune not merely a revolt, not only an experiment. He saw in it a proletarian dictatorship exercising the will of the working class to abolish these forms which made class rule possible.

Speaking about those who usually prattle of the emancipation of labor until labor really begins to emancipate itself, Marx says:

"The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilization! Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish the class property which makes the labor of many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. . . . But this is Communism, 'impossible' Communism!"

Marx shows that the middle classes had everything to gain from the Commune, and in fact, the Paris petty bourgeoisie benefited by the legislation regarding the moratorium on debts and the payments of rentals. Similarly, in the case of the peasants, Marx declares that the Commune was perfectly right in telling the peasants that "its victory was their only hope."

MARX ON "NATIONAL DEFENSE"

Marx speaks of the last stand of the Paris workers, who fought against terrific odds. He shows how their defeat was accomplished under Bismark's patronage. The fact that they were but recently enemies did not prevent the Prussians from helping Thiers in his murderous work. Marx was moved to make the following observation on the nature of nationalism and war, after witnessing the cooperation of the German militarists and French reactionaries in their onslaught on the Commune:

"The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war: and it is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of the classes thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out in civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national governments are *one* as against the proletariat."

How many socialist parties of the warring nations remembered this passage in August, 1914. Plekhanov called upon the Russian socialists to fight against Prussianism. Scheidemann and Ebert yelled about the Russian Cossacks, threatening the "free" institutions of Germany. Renaudel and Vandervelde exhorted the French and Belgian workers to defend the fatherland in the name of democracy and national interest. Henderson did the same in England, and Spargo in America. A class peace was demanded so that the workers and capitalists might all unite to fight their "common" enemy. Only the Russian Bolsheviks and minorities in the various socialist parties did not surrender their socialism and refused to fall a prey to this apostasy. The social-patriotic parties during the war have continued their class peace after the war and are today the stone around the neck of the workers who still follow them.

THE COMMUNE—THE FIRST PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

The Commune is the great tradition of the French working class. The mute walls of Pere-la-Chaise remind the French workers of the heroism of their proletarian fathers who fought for freedom from wage slavery. The Commune is also the heritage of the entire proletariat. It was the first revolution with the workers not only fighting in it but also controlling and directing it towards proletarian aims. As Lenin wrote in 1908:

“The Commune taught the European workers to consider concretely the question of the social revolution.”

The Commune is one of the brightest jewels in the workers' revolutionary diadem. Marx's tribute at the close of his historic Address testifies to the fealty of the world's proletariat to the memory of the valiant Communards and to the cause in behalf of which they fought:

“Workingmen's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of the new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.”

ENGELS ON THE COMMUNE AS A DICTATORSHIP

The Commune was the first attempt at proletarian dictatorship. It was not victorious but it was the prototype of the lasting dictatorship inaugurated by the Russian workers forty-six years afterwards. The socialists, wedded to bourgeois democracy, claim that the founders of scientific socialism did not favor proletarian dictatorship and that only the “Byzantine” Bolsheviks introduced it into the Marxian lexicon. Engels' introduction to “The Civil War in France” written in 1891, closes with the following passage:

“The German philistine (read ‘socialist’—A. T.) has recently been possessed of a wholesome fear for the phrase: dictatorship of the proletariat. Well then, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship is like? Look at the Paris Commune! This was the dictatorship of the proletariat!”

The Proletariat and War

By V. I. LENIN

[This article is taken from a report read by Lenin in Lauzanne, on October 14, 1914 (two days after Plekhanoff's), and was published in Nos. 37-38 Paris "Golos" on October 25 and 27.—EDITOR.]

THE SPEAKER divided his report into two parts: definition of the character of the given war, and attitude of Socialists to this war.

For a Marxist, a definition of the character of the war is essential in order to decide the question of his attitude to it. To make this definition one must first of all establish what are the objective conditions, and the concrete circumstances, under which the given war takes place. One must place this war into the historical surroundings in which it is taking place—only then will it be possible to define one's attitude to it. Otherwise, one gets not a materialist, but an eclectic treatment of the question.

In accordance with historical circumstances, correlation of classes, etc., one's attitude to war varies under various conditions. It is absurd to refuse on principle, once and for all, to participate in war. It is *just as absurd to divide wars into offensive and defensive wars*. In 1848 Marx hated Russia because at that time democracy in Germany could not be victorious and develop; it could not weld together the country into an indivisible national whole, as long as the reactionary hand of backward Russia was hovering over it.

To define one's attitude to the present war one must understand how it differs from former wars, what are its peculiarities. Has the bourgeoisie given such an explanation? It hasn't, and what is more it will not give it on any account. To judge by what is going on among Socialists, one would think that even they have no notion of the difference between this war and former wars. And, yet, Socialists used to explain it very well, and foresaw it. More than that, there is not a single speech by a Socialist Deputy, nor a single article by a Socialist journalist, which does not contain such an explanation. It is so simple that no attention is paid to it, and yet, it is the key to a correct attitude to his war.

The present war is an imperialist war, this constitutes its fundamental character. To ascertain it one must examine what previous wars were and what is an imperialist war.

NATIONAL AND MODERN WARS

Lenin dwelt at some length on the characterization of the wars at the end of eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century. All of them were national wars, fought in the interests of national states, and contributing to the establishment of such states.

These wars signalize the destruction of feudalism, and were the expression of the struggle between the new bourgeois society and feudal society. The national state was an inevitable stage in the development

of capitalism. Struggle for national self-determination and independence, for freedom of language and national representation served this aim—establishment of national states, which at a certain stage of capitalism is essential for the development of productive forces. Such was the character of wars since the Great French Revolution and up to the Italian and Prussian wars.

This task of national wars was carried out either by democracy itself, or with the help of Bismark, regardless of the will and consciousness of the participants themselves. National wars, wars of the budding capitalism, were necessary for the triumph of modern civilization, for the full development of capitalism.

Imperialist war is a different matter. In regard to this there was no divergence of opinion among Socialists of all countries and all tendencies. At all congresses, when resolutions on our attitude to any possible war were discussed, there was a consensus of opinion that this war will be an *imperialist war*. All the European countries had reached the same degree of capitalist development, all of them had already given everything that capitalism can give. Capitalism has reached its supreme form and no longer exports goods, but capital.

It has no longer room in, and is bursting out of, its national chrysalis, and the struggle now is for the last available remnants on the terrestrial globe. While the national wars in the eighteenth and nineteenth century signalized the beginning of capitalism, imperialist wars point to its end.

It is imperialism which puts a special imprint on contemporary wars, which makes it different from all the preceding wars.

We can ascertain our attitude to this war only by considering it in its special historical surroundings, as every Marxist should do. Otherwise we will operate with old notions and arguments applicable to other circumstances, which no longer exist. Among such obsolete notions is the notion of the fatherland, and the division of war, which I already mentioned, into offensive and defensive.

There are, of course, freedom in the vivid picture of contemporary conditions, spots painted with the old brush. For instance, of all the belligerent countries, Serbia alone is fighting for its national existence. In India and China, too, conscious proletarians have no other choice but to follow the national path, because their countries have not yet formed themselves into national states. If China had to carry on an offensive war with this aim in view we could not refuse it our sympathy because, objectively, it would be a progressive war. For the same reason Marx was entitled to propagate in 1848 an offensive war against Russia. Thus, the keynote of the end of the nineteenth century and of the beginning of the twentieth was—imperialist policy.

Imperialism is that state of capitalism when, having carried out all it could, it begins to decline. It is a special epoch, not in the consciousness of Socialists, but in actual relations. The struggle is for the division of remnants. Such is the last historical task of capitalism. How long this

epoch will last, we cannot tell. Perhaps there will be several wars like this one, but we must realize that these wars are not like former wars and that, accordingly, the tasks confronting Socialists undergo a change.

A proletarian party will probably require an utterly different type of organization for the solution of these tasks.

In his pamphlet "Weg zum Macht" Kautsky subjected to a careful examination economic phenomena, and making very cautious deductions from them, pointed out that we are entering upon a stage utterly unlike the former peaceful, gradual development.

What in conformity with this new stage the new form of organization should be, is difficult to tell now. But it is self-evident that in view of the new tasks, the proletariat will have to create new organizations, or to change the old. Therefore, all the more absurd is the fear to upset one's organization, which is so prevalent among the German Social Democrats; all the more absurd this legalism at any price.

LEGALITY AND SOCIALIST DUTY

We know that the Petersburg Committee has issued an illegal leaflet against the war. The same was done by the Caucasian and several other Russian organizations. This can, certainly, also be done abroad, and relations need not be broken off.

Legality is, of course, very precious, and it was not for nothing that Engels said: "Gentlemen of the bourgeoisie, be the first to infringe your legality!" What is happening now will probably teach the German Social Democrats a lesson, for the Government, which always prided itself on its legality, infringed it without any compunction all along the line. In this respect the peremptory order of the Governor of Berlin, which he compelled the "Vorwärts" to print on the front page, is likely to prove useful. But the "Vorwärts," promised not to allude to it to the end of the war, has signed its own "Golos" which is at present the best Socialist newspaper in Europe.

My frequent and serious disagreements with Martov make it incumbent on me to say that, at present, this writer is doing what a Social Democrat should do. He is criticizing his government, is exposing his bourgeoisie, and is attacking his Ministers. But Socialists, who, having disarmed themselves as far as their own government Ministers and ruling classes of another country, perform the role of bourgeois writers. Sudekum himself plays objectively the role of an agent of the German Government, just as others do in regard to the Franco-Russian allies.

Socialists who have not taken into account that this war is an imperialist war, who do not visualize it historically, will not understand anything in this war, and are capable of taking a childish naive view of it. It is as if, in the middle of the night, someone seized somebody else by the throat, and the neighbours have either to come to the rescue of the victim of the attack or "lock themselves in" (Plekhanov's expression) in a cowardly manner so as to keep out of the brawl. We will not allow ourselves

to be deceived and will not allow bourgeois counsellors to explain the war so simply.

THE FATHERLAND IDEA

Comrade Lenin read an extract from Luzatti's article published in an Italian paper. In this article the Italian politician glories in the fact that the great victor in the war happens to be the fatherland, the fatherland idea and declares: one should bear in mind Cicero's words that "the greatest calamity is civil war." This is what the bourgeoisie has succeeded in achieving, this is what agitates and pleases it above all.

The bourgeoisie is trying to persuade us that this is the same usual national war. This is not the case. The time for national wars is past. We are confronted with an imperialist war and it is the duty of Socialists to convert "national" war into civil war.

We, all of us, expected this imperialist war, we prepared for it. Since this is so, it does not matter at all who attacked; everyone was prepared for war, and the attack was made by the side which thought it most profitable at the given moment.

Lenin then read extracts from the Communist Manifesto, in which the fatherland idea is treated as a historical category commensurate with the development of society at a definite stage of this development, which subsequently becomes obsolete. The proletariat cannot love what it has not got. The proletariat has no fatherland.

SOCIALIST OBLIGATIONS

What are the tasks of Socialists in the present war? Comrade Lenin read the Stuttgart resolution, which was subsequently confirmed and added to in Copenhagen and Basle. This resolution shows clearly Socialist methods of struggle against tendencies making for war, and defines the duties of Socialists in regard to war when it has already broken out. These duties are defined by the examples of the Russian Revolution and the Paris Commune. The Stuttgart resolution was cautiously compiled, taking into consideration all sorts of criminal laws, but the task was clearly pointed out in it. The Paris Commune—is civil war. In what form, when and where?—is another question, but which way our work should tend is definitely stated.

From this viewpoint Comrade Lenin dealt with the position taken up in reality by the Socialists of various countries. Apart from the Serbs, Russian Socialists have done their duty, as pointed out by the Italian organ "Avanti!"; Keir Hardie is also doing his duty by exposing the policy of Sir Edward Grey.

Once war has started it is impossible to get away from it. One must go on doing one's duty as a Socialist. At the war people think and meditate perhaps even more than "at home." One must go there to organize the proletariat for the ultimate aim, because it is utopian to imagine that the proletariat will reach it by peaceful means. It is impossible to go from capitalism to socialism without breaking the national structure, just as it was impossible to go from feudalism to capitalism without national ideas.



C. E. RUTHENBERG

Ruthenberg as Fighter and Leader

By JAY LOVESTONE

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The following article was written especially as an introduction to a selection of speeches and writings of Charles E. Ruthenberg, to be published early in March by International Publishers, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York City, as Volume X in the series "VOICES OF REVOLT." The other nine volumes in the series, presenting the choice addresses of pioneer leaders of revolutionary thought and action, include Robespierre, Marat, and Danton of French revolutionary history; Lassalle, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Bebel, and Karl Liebknecht of the German revolutionary movement; Lenin, and Debs. The readers of the "Communist" are directed to these highly instructive and attractively published small volumes, which are sold at fifty cents a copy. An interesting feature of each volume is a critical introduction which throws light not only upon the man, but also upon the time in which he lived and worked. Jay Lovestone's introduction to the Ruthenberg volume is reprinted by permission of International Publishers.]

To speak of the development of the American Communist movement is to speak of the role of C. E. Ruthenberg in the class struggle in the United States. Ruthenberg was the outstanding founder and the leader of the Communist Party in the most powerful imperialist country.

Ruthenberg was anathema to the bourgeoisie. To them his name and deeds are synonymous with all that the conscious, courageous, revolutionary workers, following the path of Marx and Lenin, are thinking and doing throughout the world. That is why Ruthenberg was the most feared and hated communist in the country.

Lenin once wrote: "The communists of America prove by their long prison terms to which the bourgeoisie sentence them for communist agitation and propaganda, what capitalist democracy really means. They are tearing the masks from it and are exposing it as a reign of trust kings and speculators amid the subjection of the masses." Truly, no one symbolized this truth uttered by Lenin more than Ruthenberg did. He was thus often spoken of as the most arrested man in America.

What makes Ruthenberg a revolutionary figure of paramount importance is not merely his tremendous abilities as shown in his service in the class war against the American capitalist class, but the devotion, self-sacrifice, courage and Leninist clarity characterizing his activities. Ruthenberg always emphasized the role of the Party as the only revolutionary leader of the working class.

Characteristic of his fighting spirit is his statement in 1920 to the New York Court sentencing him to from five to ten years in

Sing-Sing Prison: "I have merely this to say for myself. I have in the past held certain ideals for a reorganization of society on a new basis. I have upheld those ideals and gone to prison for them when they were connected with the late war. I have stood by those principles in which I firmly believe and I still stand for those principles irrespective of the result of this particular trial. I expect in the future as in the past to uphold and fight for those principles until the time comes for those principles to triumph and a new society is built in place of the present social organization. . . . I will accept the sentence in that same spirit of defiance, realizing that I go to prison because of support of a great principle that will triumph in spite of all the courts, in spite of all the organizations of the capitalist class."

If we examine the basic types of characteristics of leaders of great forward social movements, we will find them to be inspiration, intelligence and industry. In Ruthenberg's whole revolutionary career we find these three fundamental prerequisites of first-rank leadership standing out in bold relief.

Ruthenberg left no theoretical works that have become standard classics in the international labor movement. All of his writings are manuals of tactics for the revolutionary movement in the United States in its various stages. Thus we will find in his writings before the proletarian revolution in Russia some of the hazy concepts and shortcomings which characterized the most militant and genuine Marxian kernels in the various socialist parties. In fact, Ruthenberg more than any one else symbolized the developing stages of working-class militancy. He shows a constant growth in his clearness and understanding of the revolutionary struggle into the full Leninist, Bolshevik viewpoint.

We must keep in mind that the achievements and contributions of any individual revolutionary leader can be estimated properly and judged only on the basis of the conditions of his times and only in comparison with contemporary leaders in the same movement. It is here that Ruthenberg stood head and shoulders above the other leaders of the socialist movement in the pre-war days. It is here that Ruthenberg appears before the entire American working class as the outstanding expression of communism in the United States.

Ruthenberg learned much and quickly from the Russian Revolution and the proletarian State of the Soviet Union. His indefatigable mastery of the principles and strategy of Leninism has gone a long way towards accelerating the building of the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

What have been Ruthenberg's main contributions to the American labor movement? One: He was the first man in the various

left wing movements to realize the value of organization. Ruthenberg always emphasized organization in a concrete, positive manner. Two: His heroic fight against the imperialist war. Here Ruthenberg was a trail blazer for the American working class in a true Leninist sense. Third: He knew how to link up the smallest, immediate, most elementary everyday needs of the workers with the biggest, most fundamental and revolutionary objectives of the whole proletarian struggle. Fourth: He was the leading founder of the Communist Party in the United States.

RUTHENBERG—THE ORGANIZER

Ruthenberg was an organizer *par excellence*. Immediately after he joined the Socialist Party in 1909, he assumed responsible organization work in the Cleveland organization as recording secretary of the City Central Committee. The Cleveland organization in the former Socialist Party symbolized strength, stability, and mass influence. Ruthenberg was quick and able to utilize the local issues for the purpose of building a Cleveland section of the national movement.

It did not take long for Ruthenberg to become nationally known as an organization builder and an outstanding local political leader. From 1909 to 1912 he served as recording secretary of the Cleveland Central Committee of the Socialist Party. In 1910 he was Socialist candidate for State Treasurer of Ohio; in 1911, candidate for Mayor of Cleveland; in 1912, for Governor of Ohio. In 1913 Ruthenberg became the Secretary and City Organizer of the Cleveland organization; he was also candidate for United States Senator of Ohio during the same year; in 1915, candidate for Mayor; in 1916, candidate for Congress; in 1917, again candidate for Mayor. In the last campaign Ruthenberg ran especially on a platform of opposition to the imperialist war, while he was appealing against his conviction for anti-war activities, and received 27,000 out of a total of 100,000 votes cast in Cleveland. In 1918 Ruthenberg was candidate for Congress and in 1919 candidate for Mayor of Cleveland.

The Cleveland City Organization of the Socialist Party, under Ruthenberg's leadership, had at its height a membership in excess of the national membership of the Socialist Party today.

It was Ruthenberg who was primarily responsible for making the left wing in the Socialist Party nationally organization-conscious. There were many who were active propagandists for the then left wing Socialism, but a few, if any in 1919, realized sufficiently the need of crystallizing a definite left wing organization on a national scale.

While he was still facing a charge of being accessory to murder, Ruthenberg assumed the arduous task of being the first secretary of the Communist Party of America. Under extremely difficult conditions he was infusing a spirit of drive and energy into the newly-born organization.

Immediately after his release from Sing Sing Prison on the reversal of the decision of conviction by the lower court by the New York State Court of Appeals, Ruthenberg became the second national secretary of the Workers' Party in 1922. Under his direction, the Workers' Party immediately made great progress in its membership rise and political influence. To the party membership, Ruthenberg appeared very clearly as the *party builder*. In every campaign of the party he was the dynamic force lending push, plan and momentum to it with his unbounded energy and inspiration. The drive for the Labor Party, the campaign to root the party in the trade unions, the efforts to win the Negro masses for the Workers' (Communist) Party, the first attempts to secure a firm foothold among the exploited agricultural masses, were all marked by Ruthenberg's intelligence and industry.

It is easily understandable then why the last words of Ruthenberg were: "Build the Party." As far back as 1912, in his first years even in the Socialist Party, when in an atmosphere of Social-Democratic haziness and confusion, Ruthenberg had a remarkably clear appreciation of the role of a revolutionary socialist party. For instance, in speaking of the treachery of Mayor Pape, elected as Socialist Mayor of Lorain, Ohio, Ruthenberg said:

"A Socialist official, who, accepting the nomination for office, refuses after getting into office to act in accordance with the wishes of the organization which trusted him, becomes a traitor to the party he pledged himself to support, and is a man who should be dishonored in the eyes of every one but those representatives of capitalism who profit by such acts of perfidy. . . . Capitalism may buy an individual; it cannot buy the Socialist Party."

RUTHENBERG—THE ENEMY OF IMPERIALIST WAR

From a Leninist viewpoint, the St. Louis Anti-War Resolution of the Socialist Party, adopted immediately upon America's entrance into the war, suffered from many serious shortcomings, but it was a barometer of the intense opposition to the imperialist war on the part of the great masses of the rank and file of the Socialist Party. Ruthenberg was the prime mover in the formulation and adoption of all that was revolutionary in the St. Louis Anti-War platform. It was he who symbolized the revolt of the proletarian

elements in the Socialist Party against the pro-Germanism of Berger, the Social-pacifism of Hillquit and the Social-chauvinism of the Spargos, Russells, Wallings, and others. His first imprisonment in the jail at Canton, Ohio, was for fighting the imperialist war and the measures taken by the American ruling class to drive America into the war. At the very outset, Ruthenberg understood the imperialist character of the last war. No illusions about democracy or "German Kultur" oppressed him. Ruthenberg declared:

"This is not a war for freedom. It is not a war for the principles of mankind. It is a war to secure the investments and profits of the ruling class of this country. . . .

"The only reason we are in this war now is because it is in the interests of the ruling class, the capitalist class of this country to have us in the war."

RUTHENBERG—THE LENINIST

Not only in his opposition to the imperialist war did Ruthenberg develop the full Leninist line but also in his attitude and practice in the daily struggles of the working masses. He was a realist in the Marxist-Leninist sense of the word. The bourgeoisie were driving the masses into the imperialist war. Ruthenberg replied: "Down with the Imperialist War."

There was an election campaign in Cleveland. Ruthenberg said to the workers: "Make this election count in your fight." Ruthenberg did not suffer from parliamentary illusions. He was not a victim of parliamentary cretinism. In April, 1912, he said:

"We are not in the business of electing mayors. The election of a mayor or any other party official is merely an incident in our work. It registers the increase in our strength and that is about all."

By 1920 Ruthenberg's estimate of the official Socialist Party theory of capturing power by the ballot was this: "The Socialist Party emphasizes the participation in elections and the election of certain officials. It had become more or less a vote-getting machine to elect certain persons to public office rather than an organization which sought to bring about a fundamental change of the social system."

While acting as organizer in Cleveland, the struggle of the teachers for the right to organize, the fight of the street car workers for an increase in wages, the battle for better housing and living conditions, better educational opportunities for the children, consumed Ruthenberg's attention as effective means of building the Socialist Party. His Leninist viewpoint on the immediate struggles are thus clearly stated: "The policy of the Communist Party

is to associate itself with the workers in the everyday struggles. The communists fight with wage workers and farmers in support of the demands which they make on the capitalists because it is in these struggles that the workers learn the character of the capitalist system, and there is developed a will to power of the workers, the determination to triumph over the enemy who exploits and oppressed them.

"The everyday struggles of the workers create the most favorable condition for establishing the influence and leadership of the Communist Party. The workers learn by experience the character of the capitalist system. They learn by their experience in the struggle that the government of the capitalist system is merely an instrument of the capitalists for maintaining the system of exploitation. . . . While fighting with the workers to realize their immediate demands against the capitalists it is the part of the communists to point out to them, at every stage of the development of the struggle, that these immediate demands cannot solve their problem. It is in the process of struggle that the revolutionary will of the workers develops and through these struggles they are leading, step by step, to the final struggle of the proletarian revolution. . . ."

As a Bolshevik, Ruthenberg always kept in the forefront the main objective of the communists in the class struggle—to revolutionize the minds and struggles of the masses and to build a powerful Communist Party to lead the workers to final victory. In all his numerous activities in the daily struggles of the workers, Ruthenberg never forgot that the primary purpose of the revolutionary working class movement in the United States is to overthrow American capitalism and to establish a proletarian dictatorship. Here Ruthenberg was a Leninist. He understood the science of the world revolution. He knew how to link up the smallest, immediate, most elementary everyday need of the workers with the biggest, most fundamental revolutionary objectives of the whole proletariat.

RUTHENBERG—THE FOUNDER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Ruthenberg was the founder of the Communist Party in the United States. His leadership of the militant proletarian forces in the Socialist Party, his revolutionary opposition to the imperialist war, the inspiration and industry characterizing his leadership of the left wing of the Socialist Party, the enthusiastic determination and energy with which he set about to build a strong Communist Party organization—all served to make him worthy of the title of "Founder of the American Communist Party."

Being one of the first working-class revolutionists in the United

States to draw the logical conclusions from the experiences of the working class during the war for the purpose of applying them to the concrete situation of the class struggle in the United States, Ruthenberg did not hesitate to break definitely with the opportunists, the reformists and social traitors dominating the Socialist Party.

Ruthenberg's faith in the party was unbounded. In his tireless work for amalgamation of the craft unions into powerful militant industrial unions, and in his energetic direction of the Labor Party campaign, Ruthenberg never lost sight of the real role of the Communist Party. In Ruthenberg's eyes: "The amalgamation of the trade unions into industrial unions and the formation of a Labor Party to fight the political battles of the working masses of this country are the first steps towards the ultimate goal of the workers' government and the Communist society. . . .

"It is because, after the first steps in the United States in the form of the organization of a Labor Party and the amalgamation of the trade unions, there will still remain these great tasks, that there must be a Communist Party—a separate distinct organization which will have in its ranks the best educated, disciplined and most militant workers such as the Workers' Party of America.

"The role of this party is to be the battalion at the front leading the working class hosts—industrial workers and farmers—forward against the enemy in spite of all persecution, in spite of the efforts of the capitalists to destroy it, until the victory of the workers is won."

Ruthenberg's courage in the class war was unbounded. Some of his best years were spent in jail. The splendid services Ruthenberg rendered to the American working class in his exemplary conduct in the Bridgeman trial in 1923 were the precipitating force for the "legalization," the right to work in the open, of communism in the United States. Ruthenberg died March 2, 1927, just as the United States Supreme Court was to pass judgment upon his conviction by the Michigan Courts for his participation in building the Communist Party.

The tremendous objective difficulties confronting the American working class in their struggles never dismayed Ruthenberg. They only steeled his revolutionary purpose, intensified his communist ardor and enhanced his Leninist clarity and determination to fight on towards the development of a mass Communist Party in the United States.

AN ESTIMATE OF RUTHENBERG

Ruthenberg hated capitalism with an immeasurable vengeance. He hated capitalism for what it meant for the workers. He al-

ways wrote about the meaning of capitalism and exploitation in simple but telling language. He wrote in 1912: "The capitalist system means the existence of a master class and a dependent class. The wealth which the workers produce but do not receive is paid to an idle, parasitic class in the shape of interest and dividends. The evils of the capitalist system which are everywhere apparent in the squalor and misery of the tenements in which millions exist, in the diseases resulting from poverty which yearly take the lives of thousands, with its consequent suffering for the unemployed and their families, in the general insecurity of the lives of those subject to the whims of the industrial masters, who know not whether on the morrow their means of livelihood may not be gone, are the by-products of the private ownership of industry and profit making through the exploitation of the workers."

In 1911 and 1912, while the Socialist official leadership was driving headlong to the right, Ruthenberg emphasized Leninist faith in the masses which was a welcome revolutionary antidote. "The rank and file are not subject to the influence which capitalism can bring to bear. They are the victims of capitalism. They suffer from capitalist institutions. They can be depended upon to remain an uncompromising opposition to capitalism until the organization which they are building up will have acquired the strength to transform existing social institutions into a new social organization which will realize the aim of socialism.

"We socialists have faith in the working class. We believe the workers have advanced too far and are too subject to industrial slavery and therefore are confident that they will assert their power to bring into existence the only alternative to capitalist despotism. . . . The working class has the power and to save itself must establish socialism."

Ruthenberg was born at a time (July 9, 1882), when American imperialism was being reared. He imbibed the weaknesses, the haziness, as well as the spirit of militancy which characterized the early movements of opposition to the rule of monopoly capital in the United States. As imperialism grew, the clarity of revolutionary perspective and program of the most advanced workers grew. Ruthenberg symbolized this growth in all its stages. The selections from his speeches and writings arranged chronologically in this little volume bring in bold relief Ruthenberg's steady and continuous development. From the very moment of his accepting Marxism as his guiding principle, he progressed without any wavering or hesitation in his work of changing the Socialist Party into an effective and Marxian party of proletarian leadership. Unable

to achieve this task, he became the leader in the foundation of the Communist Party. Vacillation, pessimism, lack of faith, temporary reversion to paths deviating from Marxism-Leninism are not to be found in Ruthenberg's inspiring revolutionary career. It can be said of Ruthenberg that he was the outstanding American proletarian revolutionary leader who followed the most consistent and logical line of revolutionary development throughout his participation in the revolutionary labor movement.

Ruthenberg lent a certain Bolshevik poise and confidence to the party work and to those associated with him in this work. As a Leninist he fought courageously and consistently for revolutionizing the American labor movement, for developing its basic organizations into militant organizations of the class war. His whole life is one of inspiration, intelligence, and industrious work and struggle in the interests of the revolutionary labor movement, in the interests of the whole proletariat.

Death removed Ruthenberg from his revolutionary post while he was still comparatively young—at the age of forty-four. These lines are being written on the eve of the first anniversary of his death. As the years go by and the American revolutionary movement of which he was so much a part broadens and deepens among the American working class, a proper appraisal will be made of his place in the American labor movement, and the quality of his leadership will become more pronounced. But he will not only be a part of the revolutionary traditions of the American labor movement. His incomparable services to the cause of the emancipation of the workers of the world have made him a part of the traditions of the world's proletariat. "We deeply grieve with you at the loss of Comrade Ruthenberg, leader of your party and of the international labor movement, whose ashes will rest beneath the Kremlin together with the heroes of the November Revolution," cabled the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Workers' (Communist) Party of America, when they learned of Ruthenberg's untimely death. The revolutionary honor accorded his memory by burying his ashes in the Red Square in Moscow bespeaks the esteem in which the Russian workers held the activities of Ruthenberg in the revolutionary movement of the international proletariat.

After the Canton Uprising

By JOHN PEPPER

THE FEBRUARY PLENUM of the Executive Committee of the Communist International will have to occupy itself very deeply with the burning problems of the Chinese Revolution.

The independent revolutionary awakening of the working class, the constantly spreading peasant uprisings, which have taken on an increasingly radical aspect with the adoption of the slogans of the plebeian agrarian revolution, and the growing pressure of the imperialists have driven the "national" bourgeoisie into the camp of the counter-revolution. This fact is one of the *most fundamental* factors to be considered in judging the general situation of the Chinese Revolution. The ex-national bourgeoisie has formed an alliance with the imperialists and militarists against the workers and peasants. *A certain consolidation of the forces of reaction is taking place in China.* This consolidation by no means signifies the end of the immediate revolutionary situation in China. Neither economically nor politically have any of the problems of the revolution been solved. The working class and the peasantry have not been vanquished. Marx said: "The advance of the revolution consolidates the forces of the counter-revolution, but this only results in giving the revolutionary forces the possibility of overthrowing the entire counter-revolution."

The peculiarity of the present situation in China consists precisely in the fact that *the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not by any means been terminated*, but the bourgeois-democratic revolution has already begun to develop into the proletarian-Socialist revolution, and several characteristics of the proletarian revolution have already shown themselves. The tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution have not yet been solved: China is not united. China has not freed herself from the yoke of the imperialists. The destruction of the remnants of feudalism and the carrying out of the agrarian revolution are the basic tasks of the struggle of the masses. The period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been terminated, but the leader of the revolution is already the proletariat, supported by its ally, the peasantry. The proletariat battles today for the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants in the form of Soviets.

Signs are multiplying of late according to which a certain change in the policy of the imperialist powers in China is being prepared—a new "peaceful" imperialist intervention. The last interventions of the imperialists were carried out at the moment when the Nationalist armies, which at the time were still playing a revolutionary role, occupied Shanghai and Nanking. Intervention was aimed at that time *against* the national bourgeoisie allied with the workers and peasants. The situation

has now radically changed. This is precisely one of the most important of the new characteristics of the Chinese situation. The ex-national bourgeoisie has fulfilled the two principal demands of the imperialists: the overthrow of the workers and peasants and the rupture with the Soviet Union. *The Nanking Government of the Kuo Min Tang Party is today nothing else but a political "comprador" of the imperialist Powers.* The new imperialist intervention is not to be carried out against the ex-national bourgeoisie of China but *in agreement with* the Chinese bourgeoisie. The intervention is to seem to bear a "peaceful" character; foreign troops are to form only the reserve, the so-called "national" armies of the Nanking Government constituting the principal forces. The Nanking Government, in some form or other, will be recognized, in order that there may be a government existent which will recognize in return the claims, privileges, and exploitation-rights of the imperialists.

The above-mentioned re-groupings of class forces and changes in political conditions, which are developing on *the basis of the economic decline, the growing chaos, the endless militaristic wars, the increasing impoverishment of the masses of workers and peasants,* are the factors which determine the position of the working class and also the relation of the Communist Party to the proletariat.

THE AUGUST CONFERENCE OF THE PARTY

The young Communist Party of China, which today forms the target of the combined forces of reaction and which must carry on its fight under the most brutal oppression of the vilest White Terror, passed during this period through a decisive, fundamental crisis. *The August Conference of the Communist Party of China signified a ruthless reckoning with the whole system of opportunistic errors of the earlier period, freed the Party from the old opportunistic leadership, and in a definitely Bolshevik manner directed its course toward armed uprising.* The Communist workers of China also in the earlier period carried on a series of heroic struggles, but the Party leadership made catastrophic, opportunistic errors. It sought to subordinate the class struggle of the proletariat to the national struggle. It saw only the various combinations of generals and politicians above and not the unfoldment of the struggles of the masses below. It neglected the main task of arming the proletariat. It shrank back before the great historic task of developing the plebeian agrarian revolution. It created a situation wherein the danger threatened that the Communist Party would become an appendage of the Kuo Min Tang. It is a sign of the indestructible vitality of the Communist Party of China that, with the help of the Comintern, it succeeded in overcoming these opportunistic dangers and in again taking its course along the main current of the revolution.

SIGNIFICANCE OF CANTON UPRISING

Without this definite settlement of accounts with opportunism the uprising in Nanchang and the southern expedition toward Swatow would

have been impossible. The August Conference created the conditions for the December uprising in Canton. *The Canton uprising*, however, not only demonstrates the complete heroism of the Chinese proletariat and the splendid fighting spirit of the Communist Party of China, but takes its place as one of the most important events of the Chinese Revolution. *The establishment of the Soviet Republic in Canton possesses an historic significance*, is the most glorious deed of the Chinese proletariat, and denotes the highest stage of development of the Chinese Revolution yet attained. The Canton uprising was put down, and the bourgeoisie of the whole world affirms with malicious joy that Canton has become "the city of the dead." The bourgeoisie records only the defeats of the revolution, and refuses to see *what a fundamental advance of the Revolution the establishment of Soviet authority in one of the most important centers of the Far East represents*. There is a symbolic significance in the fact that Canton, the cradle of the bourgeois revolution, has now also become the cradle of China's proletarian revolution. The Canton of Sun-Yat-Sen has now become the Canton of Lenin. Canton was defeated, but this defeat is the source and the guarantee of future victory.

The August Conference, which settled accounts with opportunism, the Swatow expedition and the Canton uprising are the *great plus* in the balance of the Communist Party of China in the period just elapsed.

In the analysis of the situation of the working class and of the relation of the advance guard of the proletariat to the working class it is also necessary to take into consideration those factors which represent *the minus* in the balance.

The defeats of the revolution (Shanghai, Wuhan, Swatow, Canton) have in many respects temporarily limited the activity of the working class during the recent past. The economic depression and the increasing fury of the White Terror have weakened the great *mass organizations* of the proletariat which were formed in the earlier period. The labor unions are perhaps not in condition to take in the broad masses of the proletariat; they are only skeleton organizations and often only leading committees. *Many economic strikes* embrace only a small number of workers and are often not sufficiently coordinated one with another. The strike movements carried on by the Shanghai workers during the last five months could not be carried through to victory. *The peasant uprisings*, which have taken place in many districts, have found for the most part no active support on the side of the workers' movement. *The Canton uprising did not result in any mass movements among the working class of the rest of China*. The General Strike slogan of the Communist Party was not carried out anywhere. The counter-revolutionary Kuo Min Tang is seeking everywhere to *split* the workers' ranks. It is setting up everywhere yellow labor unions, which are never genuine working-class organizations but simply appendages of the State apparatus, a section of the military forces. The yellow union of mechanics, during and after the Canton uprising proved an active counter-revolutionary force, vying with the generals in the slaughter of revolutionary workers.

This situation of the working class and the workers' movement brings with it the danger of a rift arising between the broad underlying ranks of workers, who are suppressed by the White Terror and limited in their freedom of movement, and the active revolutionary minority—the Communist Party.

This danger becomes still greater on account of the social composition of the Communist Party. Since the Party (especially its leading strata) is still composed of more students and intellectuals than is desirable and of too few workers and peasants, the break with the Kuo Min Tang and the desertion of the petty bourgeoisie necessarily provoked a certain crisis in the work of the Party. During the period of great political strikes, mass meetings, and mass demonstrations the intellectual elements of the Party were also able to play a very great role among the real toiling masses. At the present time, however, when the workers are not out on the streets but are in the factories or, unemployed, have gone back to their villages, and when the leadership of economic struggles plays a great role, many sections of this intellectual circle cannot adapt themselves to the conditions of struggle and underrate such means of struggle as mass persuasion, mass agitation, and mass propaganda.

SHORTCOMINGS IN PARTY'S WORK

This incorrect attitude, which, however, has by no means affected the whole Party and which should not be exaggerated under any circumstances, has resulted in a whole series of shortcomings in the daily work of the various organizations of the Communist Party. The most important of these shortcomings, are:

1. Neglect of work in the labor unions; neglect of the struggle for the every-day demands of the working class.

2. Too close an alliance of the labor-union movement with the Communist Party. The correct line, whereby the labor unions must be under the political guidance of the Communist Party, has been distorted in practice, so that too close an organizational connection between the labor unions and the Party has been established, in many instances the labor-union and Party committees being identical, and the labor-union organizations are often only sections of the Party instead of embracing much broader masses of workers.

3. Often strikes are called without regard to the economic situation in the industries concerned and without regard to the given relation of forces, even when there is no possibility at all of any success.

4. Strikes are called without consulting the categories of workers concerned, many times even against the will and against the vote of the workers affected.

5. Strike movements are begun under the leadership of Communists without any attempt to negotiate with the capitalists, so that the yellow labor-union leaders are given the opportunity to seize upon the leadership of the strike movement and to carry on the negotiations with the employers in the name of the workers.

6. The Terror against the yellow labor-union leaders is often not accompanied by propaganda to unmask these leaders. No attempt is made to enlighten the mass of members of the yellow labor unions, by means of propaganda and agitation, regarding the traitorous activity of these leaders.

The above-described tendencies, which show themselves on many occasions in the various party organizations and which in general *come from the neglect of the means of mass agitation and mass propaganda in the leadership of the labor unions*, must be scrupulously exposed and overcome, since they bring with them the great danger of the broad masses of workers losing their confidence in the revolutionary labor unions and the Communist Party, of the leadership of the economic struggles passing into the hands of the yellow labor-union leaders, and of the revolutionary advance-guard isolating itself from the broad masses.

With the underrating of mass agitation and mass propaganda in the leadership of the working-class also goes the tendency of some party circles to a faulty understanding of the requisite conditions for an armed uprising as a means of class struggle in certain situations. This tendency manifests itself in the first place in the conception that armed uprisings can and must be called forth, everywhere and at all times, regardless of the given relation of forces. It is a conception, according to which one must "make haste" with the armed uprising, for otherwise, due to the economic decline in the country, the increase in the closing of factories, and the atomization of the proletariat, the revolution of the workers and peasants would come too late. The November theses of the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China also take a stand against this tendency. The great problems of the correct choice of the *moment* for the uprising, of the ensuring of the broadest *mass participation*, and of the most careful, all-round political, organizational, and military preparations for the uprising must also be considered and discussed in connection with the Canton uprising. One of the most important tasks of the February plenum of the E. C. C. I. will also be to examine into those shortcomings which have been pointed out in this respect in connection with the Canton uprising. The lesson of the Canton uprising for the Chinese proletariat must not consist only in the establishment of its great major-historical significance but also in the drawing of those lessons which the next time, at future uprisings, will lead to a greater participation of the masses, to a more favorable choice of the *moment*.

These tendencies, which are manifested in many party circles in China, must be analyzed and overcome. The establishment of these tendencies, which incline toward a "revolutionary impatience," does not, however, imply that at present there are no opportunistic dangers in the Chinese Party. The basis of opportunism was the faulty adaptation of the Party to the new conditions of struggle which were created by the agrarian revolution. The basis of the above-mentioned tendencies is the faulty adaptation of many party circles to the new conditions of struggle which were created by the present re-grouping of classes. The opportunistic danger has not yet been entirely overcome; tendencies to underrate the agrarian revolution are still present. There are still many opportunistic errors in the practical every-day work of the local organizations. *This opportunism must be most sharply combatted in all its manifestations.*

Only by overcoming both dangers can and will the Communist Party of China become the leader of a *victorious* uprising of the masses of workers and peasants.

THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

The present status of the Chinese Revolution and the relation today of the Communist Party of China to the working class determines also the tasks of our Party. These tasks for the ensuing period are the following:

1. A definite course toward the uprising. The political slogan to be: Soviets!

2. No trifling with the uprising. A concrete analysis of each situation, in order to be able to determine the conditions which actually include the factors for a *victorious uprising*. Careful political, organizational, and military preparation for the uprising. Careful choice of the *moment* for the uprising. Absolute assurance of the greatest possible *mass participation* in the uprising.

3. The slogan must be raised: On to the masses! Only with the masses can a *victorious* uprising be carried out. The means of mass persuasion, mass agitation, and mass propaganda must be employed on a broad front.

4. The path of victory in China will lead through a *series of armed uprisings in separate provinces*, but this does not mean that in the carrying through of an uprising in one province one does not need unconditionally to assure the cooperation of the proletarian and peasant forces of all other parts of the country.

5. Organization of *trade unions*; their organizational reparation from the party organizations on a broad mass basis. Intensive work to win the masses of workers in the yellow labor unions.

6. Much more intensive binding and *coordination of working-class actions with the movements of the peasantry*. Organization of peasant leagues. A more determined course toward the plebeian agrarian revolution.

7. Work in the army. The Communist task of disintegrating the armies of the bourgeoisie and the militarists must become part of the daily work of the Party.

8. Building the Party: closer bonds between the Party and the masses, closer cooperation between the leading bodies and the membership of the Party, more democracy within the Party, change of the social composition of the Party in the direction of "proletarianization."

On to the masses, every-day detail work of mass agitation for the careful preparation of victorious uprisings—these are the tasks of the hour for the Communist Party of China.

Atheism and “Evolution”

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

THE NEW magazine *Evolution*, of which three numbers have so far appeared, sets out to battle with ideological reaction, but permits ideological reaction to take the offensive within its columns. It wants to be “non-political,” although it aims to fight against political laws forbidding the teaching of evolution. And its supposedly non-political character has not prevented its writers from drawing sociological implications from evolution in an anti-revolutionary sense.

It declares editorially that it will avoid taking sides in the conflict between religion and science. In its statement of purpose, it denies by implication that science is essentially atheistic. Its writers, for the most part, are either silent on this fundamental question or take a stand in favor of atheism and against a scientific explanation of the universe.

It declares that it will not publish articles “claiming that the bible is bunk,” but it does publish articles claiming that science does not contradict the belief in a spirit world and a creator.

It refuses “to make atheism its mission” or to prove “that every scientist must be an atheist” but its first three numbers have been remarkably hospitable to writers maintaining that there is no conflict between a scientific explanation of the universe and a theistic. It professes to popularize science, but its main articles so far have been in their fundamental viewpoints unscientific and anti-scientific. Although its nominal purpose is an important one, and some of its articles of fragmentary information are of value, it is doubtful whether such a magazine with such an editorial policy will not do more harm than good.

AGNOSTICISM AND MATERIALISM

The genuine scientist, in so far as he lacks the ability to generalize from his own specific field to the general nature of the universe, may take refuge in the kind of agnosticism which Engels rightly described as “shame-faced materialism”; but the editor of *Evolution* seems to have a preference for a kind of agnostic whose viewpoint should better be termed “shame-faced idealism.”

The scientist, in so far as he is scientific—and in his own special field he must be—is necessarily materialistic and atheistic. At the

very least he will admit that within the field of the observable phenomena which he analyzes and with which he experiments he must "act as if materialism were correct." But, if he has secret yearnings for religion and idealism, or if he lacks the courage of his convictions and a conscious philosophy, he will hasten to add that outside of the field of observable phenomena, he "does not know how it may be."

David Starr Jordan, in the January number of *Evolution*, puts this possibility of a religious explanation just beyond the known, in a negative form at the beginning of his article, where he writes: "We have no data on which we can assume that an orderly universe such as ours could exist without an Ordainer." And he ends his article more positively with the declaration that "The more we know of life and of the world, the more surely can we walk upon the earth's crust in adoration." Such "scientists" *Evolution* chooses to write its leading articles, and to such uses it permits its "neutral" columns to be put!

It is interesting to contrast these shame-faced idealist agnostics such as Jordan with the "shame-faced materialists" described by Engels.

"As soon," writes Engels, "as our agnostic has made these formal mental reservations, he talks and acts as the rank materialist he at bottom is. He may say that, as far as *we* know, matter and motion, or, as it is now called, energy, can neither be created nor destroyed, but that we have no proof of their not having been created at some time or other. But if you try to use the admission against him in any particular case, he will quickly put you out of court. If he admits the possibility of spiritualism *in abstracto*, he will have none of it *in concreto*. As far as we know and can know, he will tell you there is no creator and no Ruler of the universe. (Contrast this with Jordan's "We have no data on which we can assume that an orderly universe such as ours could exist without an Ordainer.") As far as we are concerned, matter and energy can neither be created nor annihilated. For us, mind is a mode of energy, a function of the brain. All that we know is that the material world is governed by immutable laws, and so forth. Thus, as far as he is a scientific man, as far as he *knows* anything, he is a materialist; outside his science, in spheres about which he knows nothing, he translates his ignorance into Greek and calls it agnosticism."

JOHN M. WORK DEFENDS HIS SOUL

John M. Work, the philistine vulgariser of socialism of the *Milwaukee Leader* also becomes qualified to speak on this subject of the philosophical implications of science for *Evolution*. The "Marxian" Socialist goes the liberal David Starr Jordan one better in his attack upon materialism in the February issue of the magazine where he writes:

"The present existence of the soul is as evident as the existence of the body. Whether or not the soul is immortal is a disputed question, but there is nothing in evolution which precludes its immortality, and many great thinkers—scientists and otherwise—believe it to be immortal."

Such are the words of the men who set out to tell the American working class "What's so and what isn't" about Marxism. Any wonder that Marx complained that he sought to reap armed men from his sowing of dragon's teeth and reaped fleas!

EMPIRICISM AND MATERIALISM

The favorite form of "shame-faced materialism" or of "shame-faced idealism," especially for America, is "systematic empiricism." It seems rigidly jealously scientific, it takes the formal side of the scientific rejection of metaphysics and rides it to death. It gives ideological reaction all the advantages of appearing scientific without the disadvantages of having to accept the conclusions as to the nature of the universe which science might force upon it. It is quite evident that the editors of the magazine in question do not know the difference between it and materialism, between "systematic empiricism" and a scientific explanation of the universe.

That the counterfeit should pass off for the real coin is not surprising. Modern scientists in general, in so far as they lack a general theory or *Weltanschauung*, have a tendency to seek refuge in "systematic empiricism." But America, the land of "pragmatism," with its historically evolved "Anglo-Saxon" contempt for theory reinforced by the unworkability of ready-made theories of the old world for the pioneer life and the unparalleled expansion of the new, is the very stronghold of this "ersatz-science," this substitute for science—"systematic empiricism." In its name, Eastman can revise Marxism, Pupin can find God, James can find "experimental proofs" of the "validity of religious experience," Lodge can find spooks that spend eternity rapping tables and making propaganda for the sale of realty developments in heaven. It is high time that American Marxism joined issue with this thoroughly American form of ideological reaction masked as science.

The trick of the "systematic empiricist" is to occupy himself eternally with practice, without ever permitting himself to generalize from it to theory which will illumine in advance uncharted fields for new practice. He accepts the step-at-a-time but battles against an attempt to chart a line of march. Marking time is his favorite manner of marching, and the "double-quick" is not in his drill manual. He busies himself inspecting and counting trees but denies that one can come to any valid conclusions about the forest as a whole—denies that there are woods, only trees. He reduces

reality to a chaos of separate phenomena, each of which can be analyzed separately, one at a time, to all eternity, but denies that their interconnection and more or less accurate inclusive generalizations arrived at.

THE REACTION TAKES SCIENTIFIC FORM

Systematic empiricism, as a viewpoint which denies the possibility of a scientific explanation and grasping of the universe, has the tremendous advantage over other forms of ideological reaction of being "scientific" in form.

Science itself has great need of empirical methods. In its battle with theology and metaphysics, with scholastic dogmatism and fantastic speculation, science rightly insisted on the necessity for experiment, for examination of experience, for observation of reality, for an empirical testing of revealed "truths" and transmitted dogmas. This was and is correct and necessary.

But the systematic empiricist would limit us wholly to fragmentary bits of knowledge empirically acquired. Just as the "practical" opportunist seemed to have right on his side in condemning the neglect of the everyday needs and struggles of the working class by the infantile leftist who had his eyes fixed on the "final aim," and just as the opportunist then followed up his advantage by trying to limit the working class entirely to everyday questions and deny their connection with the "final aim" altogether; so the "systematic empiricist" takes from science its correct rejection of generalizations not based upon observation, experiment and practice, and uses this as a weapon to deny the possibility of generalization altogether. "Systematic empiricism" is the "economism" or "opportunism" of the bourgeois apologist in the philosophical field. It is intellectual nihilism which has nothing in common with Marxism and denies the possibility of science altogether.

A little comparison will help to make the matter clear. We can think of the region still unexplored by science and human knowledge as a vast territory occupied by a dangerous enemy. The "professional empiricist" may be compared to a treacherous general who, having defeated the enemy in decisive engagements, refuses to advance to occupy the territory in question opened up by the victory. He fails to follow up the enemy so that it should have no chance to reform. In the interests, no doubt, of what the professional empiricist calls "economy of effort," he stays on the spot where the battle was fought and declares: "I cannot advance in any given case beyond the field of battle. Before I can advance again, I must win a new victory, and with each victory I am never justified in

going beyond the limits of the particular field on which the victory was won.”

Meanwhile, the defeated enemy retains and ravages the territory that was commanded by the strategic point it has lost, regains morale and reforms its ranks and is able again and again to give battle to the slow-creeping empiricist substantially on the same spot.

DELIBERATE LIMITING OF THE FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE

The object and class meaning of empiricism as a system is to limit as rigidly as possible both the occupied territory and the methods that the mind can pursue in occupying it. Thus it leaves a vast and strategically important territory unoccupied as twilight land, no man's land, any man's land, ghost land!

And ghost land it is! Beyond the known is no longer merely the not-yet-known which is similar in character, of the same general order and to be occupied largely by the same general methods. No. Beyond the known is the “unknowable.”

THE WONDERFUL BEYOND-THE-KNOWN

In the land Beyond-the-Known anything can happen. The soldiers there may be of a *different order* of being, without bodies to shoot at but with a hundred arms apiece to hold machine guns. They may have bodies that are incorporeal and thoughts without a brain to think them. Perhaps they don't occupy space but can push you out of the space you occupy, while their incorporeal bodies offer no resistance to your attempts to push back at them. There, no doubt, in the branches of woods that have no trees you will find the famous grin of the Cheshire cat that has no cat behind the grin. Here surely Michael Pupin can find his god, Sir Oliver Lodge can find his disembodied cabinet makers that are forever testing the solidarity of tables by rapping them with the fingerless hands of their insubstantial substance. “Scientists” who are “shame-faced idealists” can find disembodied mind, energy which has no objective existence outside of consciousness, pure motion where nothing moves—in short, all forms of unscience and anti-science. It is the wonderful land where anything can happen and where all things are possible. Only one thing is unlikely, namely that it should have the same kind of land and water and woods and trees and creatures and things that the known portion of the world, the occupied territory, has. This alone is “dangerous to assume.” This alone is not possible.

“ECONOMY OF THOUGHT”

The systematic empiricists are great believers in the “economy of thought.” This too originated in the correct rejection of the piling

up of hypotheses superfluous to the explanation of problems and only complicating the problems by adding one more "solution" to explain. But in the hands of these gentlemen, "economy of thought" becomes the duty of avoiding generalizations beyond the minimum actually forced upon one by a given set of experiences. Thus again the amount of occupied territory is limited as much as possible in the name of rigid adherence to the appearance of "scientific method" and the way cleared for that which is empirical in form to find means of being metaphysical in content.

Empiricism thus becomes not a means of aiding the mind to sound generalization and a grasping of the universe but a system of limiting the mind.

A METAPHYSICAL CONCEPT OF RELATIVITY

Similarly with the correct scientific conception that all truths are relative and subject to constant revision and clarification as we develop new means of testing them and new knowledge of the nature of the universe. This is converted into a denial that science or knowledge of the universe is cumulative at all. It is denied that science is an ever-clearer knowledge of nature. The very concept of relativity itself is understood in an absolute and metaphysical sense and the concept that the generalizations of science are the best working hypotheses that a given state of knowledge warrants is converted into the viewpoint that these generalizations are merely convenient fictions, subject not to revision and improvement and growing approximation to a knowledge of the universe but to substitution by other fictions, all of them alike, arbitrary.

Here the fundamentalist steps in, the anti-evolutionist with his literal bible worship, and says: "I quote not from my bible but from the bible of science. Does not Mr. Such-and-such (who is of course accepted as a great scientist) say himself that all the theories of science are but man-made fictions, pure assumptions, guesses with no possibility of proof and no validity except the desire of certain people to believe them!"

LOGIC-TIGHT COMPARTMENTS

A favorite device of the "systematic empiricist" is to accept the possibility of generalization within a given scientific field, but to deny the possibility of generalization from one science to another. They deny that there are or can be any generalizations applicable to all sciences. They keep all the little armies of occupation rigidly separate, without making a common attack against the enemy

which would enable the military command of much land which lies in between the space actually taken up by one little detachment and another.

Nothing irritates these people more than to be told, for example, that mutations in biology, cataclysm in geology, revolutions in sociology, the conversion of stresses to breaks in mechanics, etc., give evidence that in every "department" of life and the universe, slow change at certain points is transformed into rapid change or, to use the "technical jargon" of Hegel, "quantity passes into quality."

"Breaks in mechanics? Yes. Cataclysms in geology? Yes. Mutations in biology? Yes. Revolutions in Sociology? *Maybe*. But how do you dare to generalize about change in general and about the nature of the changing universe?"

Or again: "Objective reality in my department? Yes. Objective reality in his department? *Maybe*. But how dare you generalize that the universe as a whole has an objective existence?"

Or again: "That I must 'proceed' as if there were no god pushing around the stars? Of course. No god tying up hydrogen and oxygen who may suddenly decide that he prefers his water mixed differently? Naturally. No god pulling off an earthquake or an eclipse whenever he is angry because the Pope has slept with some one he shouldn't have? Sure. But how dare you say that in the fields in which I am not working God may not be hiding?"

"Materialism in chemistry, materialism in astronomy, materialism in physics, materialism in biology, materialism perhaps *even in history*—but materialism everywhere? Materialism in the universe as a whole? How materialistic? God forbid."

THE "SCIENCE" OF ANTI-SCIENCE

Playing with the words "experience, experiment, empiricism," the pragmatist even finds "scientific proof" of his unscience and anti-science. "Aren't there such things as 'religious experience'?" he demands. "Can't Billy Sunday produce anticipated effects from a known technique? Doesn't religion *work*? Hasn't it (in patent medicine fashion) cured my blindness, Brother Hardshell's lumbago, and Sister Ancient's promptings of the flesh?"

And the Christian Scientist (!) can even cure spavined horses by laying on of hands, by assuring them that there is no spavin, that all spavin is "error," that there is no flesh to spavin, only spavinless spirit. Horses have been cured of spavin by "absent treatment!" Thus does anti-science borrow the tiniest allowable fig leaf to cover its shame-faced idealist nakedness.

To return, in closing, to the new magazine which formed the text for this discussion. In the columns of its three slender issues, we find "scientists" who deny mutations in favor of "slow evolution" without jumps. We find others, the "theoreticians," vigorously combatting the tendency to generalize from science to science. (Our insistence that it can be and must be done, does not mean that Marxists accept transference from one field to another by mechanical analogy without considering each field and system in its own concrete differences, essential peculiarities and special terms—but that's another story for which there is no room in this article.)

David Starr Jordan, who is the most learned and subtle of the writers described above, handles the battle for creeping empiricism and rigid metaphysical departmentalization and separateness in skillful fashion. Thus he writes:

"A second class called evolutionists, often very baffling to workers themselves, are the imperfectly educated who accept evolution but are impatient with the slow progress which actual knowledge demands. They delight to run ahead of science and to anticipate it by methods of fancy, using fragments of philosophy, bits of poetry, or of assumed 'logical necessity.' In science we can know the truth only so fast as we can find it out. Science is embarrassed by tradition and intuition alike."

One would hardly be suspicious of such a clever statement of his case which subtly lumps tradition and intuition, poetry and logical necessity together, did one not know what Jordan is driving at. And indeed it is only six paragraphs later on that Jordan has reached the "poetry and fancy" and tradition and the unknowable himself with the following thunderous paragraph:

"We have no data on which we can assume that an orderly universe such as ours *could exist* without an Ordainer. (The negation seems to go with "data" but really goes with the word "could;" otherwise Jordan would have had to say "necessarily must exist." B. D. W.) Nor does our mental make-up react favorably to the idea. But of the Infinite Intelligence or Supreme Force (capitals are not mine—B. D. W.) different men in different ages have had endless diverging conceptions. A 'Creator,' to use a very insufficient human word, must certainly be as broad as His Works. Infinite traits cannot be expressed in our very finite language, nor can they be understood by our very finite human brain. Hence our duties, towards one another and towards ourselves, which we agree are also our duties towards the infinite, (imagine having duties towards the "Infinite!"—B. D. W.) press upon us *more* actively and actually than conceptions of Theology, which is the science of what no one knows nor ever can know in any detail."

Notice how Jordan, while performing his task of saving religion and "reconciling" it with science by rejecting its most grossly dis-

proved dogmas and saving theism from outworn theology, even leaves room for theology along with theism by his remark that the conceptions of theology press upon us *less actively* which means that they "press" nevertheless. Also by his contrasting the less active pressure of Theology with the more active press of no less a matter than "our duties towards the Infinite." And finally defining Theology as "the *science* (!)" not merely of "what no one knows" (that would be bad enough) but of the twilight land in which no one "ever can know."

After that we are too callous to be shocked at Jordan's rejection of mutations as of significance in evolution, his definition of "competition" as always between individual men, animals, or plants, (never between groups, classes, herds, hives, etc.) nor his final conclusions that "The more we know of life and of the world, the more surely can we 'walk the Earth's crust in adoration.' . . ."

Such is the *piece de resistance* of *Evolution* and this magazine which sets up to fight fundamentalism is really fighting dialectic materialism and a scientific approach to the universe much harder. Whatever the intentions of the editor may be, and in spite of some really good factual articles of popularization of material on vestigial survivals and other evidence for evolution (such as the articles by Bernhard J. Stern in the January and February numbers) the magazine takes its stand against fundamentalism but also against scientific materialism and for theism, fideism, spiritualism and every kind of "modern" and "enlightened" ideological reaction, with even fundamentalism having an opportunity to sneak in again by the back door.

Capitalist Efficiency “Socialism”

By WM. Z. FOSTER

[The first part of this article was printed in the February Communist.]

THE EMPLOYERS' OFFENSIVE AND THE TRADE UNIONS

THE CHARACTERISTIC of the present situation in the United States is a tremendous movement by the employers for the rationalization of industry, for the development of cheaper, standardized, mass production. To accomplish this they require a docile, demoralized working class which can be cajoled or driven into acceptance of the general program of industrial speed-up. Consequently, the employers are pushing through on all fronts for the liquidation of the workers' class ideology and the breaking down of all their organs of class struggle, economic and political. In this fight, they are using not only the demoralizing capitalist efficiency “socialism” to weaken the workers and their organizations, but also the inevitable methods of frontal attack.

In this drive of the employers the trade unions are rapidly being broken down. From 1919 to 1928 the attack has gone on with varying degrees of intensity. There was the great offensive of 1919-23 to strip the workers of the wages, conditions, and unions they had built during the war. This covered nearly all organized industries, and resulted in heavy defeats for the workers. Finally the great attack has climaxed in the long drive against the Miners' Union and by the breakdown of that organization during the present bituminous strike. The whole offensive of the employers has been marked by an unprecedented use of the various branches of government by the employers against the trade unions. The entire trade union movement is undermined and threatened by this successful offensive of the employers. Its numbers have been seriously reduced; it has been driven from the heavier, key sections of industry; its morale has been greatly lowered; its leadership has become more reactionary and corrupt. The crisis is far-reaching and fundamental.

The trade union leaders, instead of adopting the elementary measures of resistance necessary to check this great open shop drive by amalgamating the craft unions into industrial unions, by the organization of the unorganized, by the formation of a labor party, by carrying through a militant policy, etc., embarked at an early stage upon a program of progressive surrender to the employers,

especially after the disastrous national strike of railroad shopmen in 1922. With their B. & O. Plan, trade union capitalism, and other phases of their newer class collaboration, which they developed in 1923-26, they walked right into the capitalist efficiency "socialism" trap of the employers. They set out to turn the trade unions into adjuncts of the employers' producing forces and instruments for the support of capitalism generally.

But the employers and the trade union leaders are not fully in agreement as to the methods to be employed in dragooning the workers into the mass production speed-up program. The trade union leaders have accepted in principle the increased efficiency program. Ideologically they have surrendered almost completely to the capitalists. They have absorbed most of the illusions and practices of capitalist efficiency "socialism." But upon one point they have deep disagreement with the employers. The trade union leaders, having in mind before all else the defense of their own group interests as a bureaucracy, lay down as their principal condition for complete support of the employers' speed-up program that the employers practice their capitalistic "industrial democracy" and "co-operation" with the workers through the instrumentality of company unionized trade unions formally independent of company control. The trade union leaders want a dues-paying organization wherewith to feather their own nests. To accept company unionism in its present forms means to liquidate themselves as a national bureaucracy. They, therefore, ask for "union-management co-operation"; that is to say, the spread of unionism in the industries on the basis of a general application of the employers' speed-up by collaboration of the employers and the unions. Presumably the workers are to share in the increased returns from this "co-operation." This is the so-called "new wage policy."

On this basis the trade union leaders are making the welkin ring with appeals and calls to the employers to develop a general system of industrial collaboration with the unions. They are eager to help the employers drive the workers. In return they agree to make their unions of the yellowest—the notorious Watson-Parker railroad law shows how far they will go in this direction. Their whole proposition, as shamelessly stated by themselves, is to make the trade unions even more efficient instruments for exploiting the workers than are the company unions. All they ask is that they be the recognized leader of the employers' organizations of workers.

THE EMPLOYERS AND UNION MANAGEMENT CO-OPERATION

But this proposal does not stop the frontal attack, union-smashing campaign of the employers. The great body of employers reject

the union leaders' offers. Only in industries where the unions are actually or potentially strong do the employers accept the new wage policy of union-management "co-operation" such as in the railroads and in the anthracite coal fields. And in these instances they accept it only as a means to still further weaken and demoralize the existing unions as preparatory steps to breaking them up altogether if and when they deem it advisable.

In the great unorganized, trustified industries the answer of big capital to the "union-management co-operation" proposals of the A. F. of L. leadership is an emphatic "No." This was strikingly illustrated in the automobile industry when the employers completely rejected the offers of the A. F. of L. leaders to establish "union-management co-operation" whereupon the "organizing campaign" of the unions was completely abandoned. In not a single instance, despite three years of intensive propaganda by the A. F. of L., have the employers in big, unorganized industries agreed to organize their workers in accordance with the A. F. of L. program. They go right ahead with their open shop campaign, smashing such fragmentary unions as may now exist and taking drastic action (see Colorado) against any unions that may develop. The new wage policy has made a monumental failure to extend even the weakest, yellowest form of unionism among the unorganized workers.

Various considerations impel the employers of the great unorganized industries to reject the A. F. of L.'s "union-management co-operation" proposals: (1) Absence of great mass pressure from the workers. Were large masses of the workers in movement, or were the unions solidly entrenched in the industries, the employers would tend much more, for their own protection, to accept the A. F. of L. program as a means to demoralize them. As it is, these powerful employers feel able to control their workers on "open-shop" basis. (2) Disbelief of the efficiency role of unions in production. The employers do not in the main subscribe to the idea behind the new wage policy that the workers in the shops have to be organized into unions in order for the greatest industrial efficiency to be developed. Even their company unions they have built rather as bars against the spread of trade unionism than as direct adjuncts to production. (3) Danger of left wing capturing even yellow unions. The employers fear that were broad unions, formally independent, created the left wing would find ways of developing mass pressure through them against the employers. They feel safer with no unions at all, or at the most, company unions which are entirely in their hands.

The trade union leaders are banking everything on the acceptance of their "union-management co-operation" policy. They have surrendered ideologically to the employers' speed-up program. They are taking no steps whatever to strengthen the unions by consolidating and extending them. Their programs, much heralded, of organizing the unorganized, depend upon such an acceptance. It is not impossible that they would, in the event of such an acceptance, also then tend to amalgamate the unions—for most company unions are industrial in form. These measures would be to control the workers better for the capitalists, not to unite them for struggle.

But the great employers are disregarding the A. F. of L. leaders' pleas and are going ahead with their anti-union campaign. The new wage policy program cannot build up even the weakest unions in the unorganized industries, nor maintain even the existing unions. The employers demand a still more complete surrender, or even entire liquidation of the trade unions. How far they will go in breaking up the unions was seen in the 1919-23 open shop drive when even such organizations of skilled workers as the building and printing trades unions were forced to fight for their very lives. The employers consider the reactionary labor bureaucracy as an asset in their struggle to exploit and control the workers, but in the present objective situation they are unwilling to pay for them the high price of the organization of their workers. The American trade union movement is in danger. The intensified open shop attacks of the employers, culminating in the smashing of the Miners' Union, and the reliance of the autocratic and deeply entrenched trade union bureaucracy upon the utterly futile program of "union-management co-operation" jeopardizes the economic organizations of the workers. The slogan "Save the Trade Unions" becomes a living watchword to rally masses for struggle against the employers and their henchmen, the reactionary trade union leaders.

THE INDUSTRIAL DEPRESSION AND THE EMPLOYERS' OFFENSIVE

In American industries a deep recession now exists. At least 3,000,000 workers are unemployed. The perspective is that the immediate future will see the extension of this depression. The employers are taking advantage of the depression to push their offensive with renewed vigor against the workers' standards and organizations. In many industries, such as shoe, textiles, automobiles, rubber, etc., wage cuts are being made. This wage-cutting campaign is upon a far wider scale than is generally recognized. Often in piece work industries it results in increased speed up, the workers trying to make up by faster working what they lose on

piece prices. The pressure against the unions is being intensified in various ways, by more militant anti-union policies in the shops, by extensive application of injunctions, etc.

Under this added pressure the upper trade union leadership goes further and faster to the right, typical of their policy being the hopelessly reactionary attitude of the miners' officials in the present deep crisis of their union. The A. F. of L. officialdom, instead of developing a fighting policy and building up the unions, will make even greater concessions to the employers unless checked by surging mass movements of the rank and file workers. They will find ways to travel still further in the direction of company unionism, of capitalist efficiency "socialism," of becoming slave drivers for the bosses. They will fight the left wing more viciously. They will become even less responsive to the pressure from their rank and file. Their policy must result in more development in the direction of independent unionism, on the one hand by their splitting off militant sections of the unions that demand a fighting policy, and on the other through the increasing necessity for the left wing to organize new unions where the leaders of the old organizations refuse to unionize the masses. This by no means indicates that the Communists should desert the old unions. On the contrary, the left wing will never surrender these organizations to their reactionary leaders. We can and will work successfully in them. But the organization of the great unorganized masses remains our central task and it must be accomplished either within or without the old trade unions.

INCREASED RESISTANCE OF THE WORKERS

Among the workers increasing currents of discontent and resistance are plainly discernible. In the textile, automobile, shoe, needle and other industries as well as far and wide among the miners, this is in evidence. Low wages, wage cuts, the speed-up, mass unemployment, are at the bottom of this discontent. The industrial depression is sharpening these tendencies and further predisposing the workers to struggle. During the past years of high industrial activity the real wages of the workers, especially in the skilled trades, advanced somewhat. But these gains are being rapidly wiped out in the present industrial depression. The attending resentment of the workers will be directed not only against the capitalists, but also against the reactionary trade union officialdom who refuse to defend the workers' interests. To develop and lead militant struggles against wage cuts, against the speed-up, and against lengthening of the workday is of fundamental importance. We must raise slogans of the shorter workday and social insurance to

combat unemployment as well as for the organization of the unemployed. We must unite both the organized and the unorganized to defend their threatened living standards.

A favorable factor in the present situation in the United States tending to break down the relative isolation of the left wing is the tendency of the progressives, or middle group, to break its united front with the right wing union officialdom. This united front was formed in the years following the big 1922 railroad strike and was built around the various phases of the "new orientation" or "higher strategy of labor." But trade union capitalism is a manifest failure, as demonstrated clearly by the B. of L. E. debacle, the B. & O. Plan is even more of a failure, the La Follette movement is dissolved and the right wing has fled back to the two old parties. All of which tends to disillusion the best elements among the progressives about these class collaboration policies, to cut them loose from the right wing, and to predispose them to making united front movements with the left wing on the basis of elementary programs of struggle. It is the task of the T. U. E. L. to unite these elements in the unions, for struggle against the union leaders and employers, for the organization of the unorganized, for the labor party, etc. Such united front movements, however, must be based upon mass contacts and with the left wing emphasizing its leading role. The disillusionment of the progressives is intensified by the spread of the industrial depression which emphasizes the bankruptcy of right wing leadership.

The employers are carrying through a great offensive against the ideology, standards, and organizations of the workers. The workers are developing the mood and spirit to resist this offensive. It is our Party's task to organize their fight and to give them leadership to strive to develop a counter-offensive. They are becoming increasingly responsive to our slogans for a Labor Party, for the organization of the unorganized, amalgamation, etc., as well as to our general party program of struggle against all phases of American imperialism. In the United States it is a period of increasing discontent and struggle in which, with proper policies and Communist aggressiveness, we can make real progress in building our Party, the T. U. E. L., and the various organs of our movement.

Save-the-Miners' Union Call

[*The COMMUNIST prints below a document that promises to be of historic significance to the American labor movement. It is a call issued to the 800,000 coal miners of America by the Save the Union Committee, convoking a national conference to be held in Pittsburgh on April 1st. Addressed to organized and unorganized miners alike, it aims to rally the whole industry to defeat the attacks of mine operators, their governmental agencies, and their tools in the U. M. W. A. The April 1st Conference called in the battle center of the coal war will in large measure determine the fate, not only of the miners' union but of the entire organized labor movement of which it forms the backbone.—EDITOR.*]

Pittsburgh, March 1, 1928.

GREETINGS:

To all local unions and members of the United Mine Workers of America and the miners of the unorganized districts:

The National "Save the Union Committee" will hold a great national conference of coal miners in Pittsburgh on April first. The purpose of this conference will be to work out a program to meet the deep crisis which has been brought upon the union by the incompetence and corruption of the Lewis administration. The conference will take definite steps for winning the Pennsylvania-Ohio strike, to defeat the nation-wide attacks of the operators and their government agencies upon the union and the wages and working standards of the miners, to oust the Lewis machine and to place the union in the hands of the miners, to abolish corruption in the union and make it into an invincible weapon of the 800,000 coal miners, to lay plans for the organization of the great masses of unorganized miners so shamefully neglected by the Lewis henchmen.

This conference is held pursuant to resolutions unanimously adopted by the big "Save the Union" conferences in Districts 5, 6, 12 and the anthracite tri-districts, which represent the sentiment of these conferences. Spontaneous movements of the mass of miners have enormously strengthened the strike and show that the workers are inspired at the prospect of a real struggle in defense of their interests. You are urged to send delegate to this vital conference which will initiate a determined fight to save our organization and living standards.

[175]

BOSSES' ANTI-UNION DRIVE . .

The United Mine Workers is in the most serious crisis in its history. The coal operators, assisted by the courts and police, are attacking it on all fronts. The Lewis administration through its reactionary policies, has made no real defense, consequently district after district has been lost. Now the operators are trying to break the backbone of the union by destroying Districts 2, 5 and 6 in the present strike. They are using all methods from federal and state injunctions to evictions of our members and their families and the most brutal attacks upon us by the National Guard, the state constabulary, the coal and iron police and other organized gangs of coal operators thugs. Over 500,000 men, women and children in the coal fields are facing cold, sickness and starvation.

President Lewis, with his international and district machines, has forced upon the union a policy which has brought it to the verge of destruction. During the whole life of the Jacksonville agreement the Lewis machine made no attempt to prepare the union for the present struggle and refused to conduct effective organizational work in the non-union territories.

FAILURE TO ORGANIZE MINERS

Lewis is cooperating with the coal companies to drive 200,000 miners out of the industry. He has already succeeded in forcing 200,000 miners out of the union. The refusal of the Lewis machine to organize West Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee and sections of Western Pennsylvania has allowed the operators to cut wages in these territories and to flood the market with cheaply mined coal to break our strike and disrupt the union.

Against the militant miners who pointed out the dangers which the union faced and who urged the union to adopt a fighting program, President Lewis carried on an open war. Hundreds of loyal members and whole locals and districts in Nova Scotia, Kansas, Alberta, Anthracite, Illinois, etc., have been expelled for opposing the judicial policy of the Lewis machine.

Democracy in the union has become merely a memory. Lewis rules like a czar. He packed the last convention, steam-rolled the rank and file delegates and raised his salary to \$12,00 per year. From June to December, 1927, while the striking miners were starving on a dollar or two a week relief money, Lewis drew \$11,093.66 for salary and personal expenses. The salaries of Murray and Kennedy were also raised to \$9,000.

The Lewis machine has never been elected. It stole the election from the Howat forces in 1920, from Voysey in 1924, and from

the Brophy "Save the Union" slate in 1926. It does not represent the choice or will of the membership.

Lewis refused to enforce the Jacksonville agreement during the life of the contract. The operators were allowed to do as they pleased, systematically breaking up the union and robbing the miners of hard-won conditions, by cutting wages, by refusing to pay for all kinds of dead work, by cutting the yardage rates, by refusing to pay for the setting up of timber and bailing of water, by placing two or three miners in one room, etc.

LEWIS FOR SEPARATE PACTS

Before the strike began, April 1, 1927, Lewis offered to sign separate district agreements and thus to wipe out the policy of the Central Competitive Field agreement which our union fought for years to get and maintain.

For almost six months after the strike was called the Lewis machine did nothing to organize strike relief.

The failure of the union officials to organize mass picketing and mass violation of the injunctions was a betrayal of the strike. The Fagans, Halls, etc., did nothing to win the strike. They systematically suppressed all militancy in the strike. They preached reliance on the A. F. of L. officials' conferences of reactionaries, on appeals to Coolidge, Fisher and Pinchot and to empty senate investigations.

Lewis and Fishwick of District 12 betrayed the strike by signing a separate agreement for Illinois, they deserted the Pennsylvania and Ohio miners and took the pressure off the Illinois operators during the winter. They put over an arbitration and speed-up agreement for District 12. Now the operators in Illinois, strengthened by Lewis' policies, are insisting upon \$1.50 wage cut and a decrease of 24 cents in the tonnage rates. They are out to break up the union. 40,000 Illinois miners are unemployed while the operators install labor displacing machinery without a wage differential, and Lewis and Fishwick are cooperating with them in this. The same separate agreement policy followed in Indiana.

In the anthracite the arbitration agreement signed by the Lewis-Capellini machine in 1925, together with the joint action of the operators, the contractors and the tri-district officials, is wrecking the union. 70,000 anthracite miners are jobless or working one or two days per week.

MILITANTS SHOT DOWN

The operators are allowed to violate the contract at will. Wage rates are being reduced in many ways. Grievances are not adjusted

by the district machines. The contractor system is throwing thousands of miners out of work. Local union officials and rank and file leaders who fight for an honest and militant union are shot down by Cappelini gunmen as were Thomas Lillis, Samuel Grecco and Alex Campbell and Pete Reilly. Militant miners are framed up as in the case of Sam Bonita. It is the same frame-up system that was used against Corbishley and the other Zeigler, Illinois miners who are now in jail.

Loading machinery adds to the unemployment. Through the Anthracite Boosters' Association, the district officials join with the operators and business men to "lower the cost of anthracite"—which means in reality to reduce wages, speed up the miners and worsen working conditions.

The union in the anthracite is in great danger. It is being betrayed into the hands of the operators by the Lewis-Cappelini-Golden-Kennedy machine.

In the southwestern districts and in Canada the reactionary policies of Lewis have wrecked the union.

UNION FIGHTING FOR LIFE

For ten years under the Lewis administration the union has steadily grown weaker, until now it is fighting for its very life.

The weakening of the miners' union precipitates a crisis in the whole trade union movement. Encouraged by success in the coal industry the open shop employers are intensifying their drive against all sections of the labor movement.

Lewis attempts to explain away the breakdown of our organization on the ground of over-production in the industry, the use of substitutes for coal, etc. But this false claim will not permit the Lewis machine to hide the disastrous effects of its policies and escape responsibility. With an aggressive policy for shorter hours, and for the organization of the unorganized, the union could have been built up and conditions in the mines improved despite the so-called over-production.

MINERS, THE TIME HAS COME FOR ACTION!

The "Save the Union Committee" calls upon all members of the United Mine Workers and the miners in the unorganized districts to unite to smash the conspiracy against the miners' union and living and working conditions in the mining industry.

STRIKE MUST BE WON

The miners must unite. The strike can and must be won. We

must mobilize our full forces to spread the strike and to beat back the open shop attacks of the employers.

The Lewis machine and its ruinous policies must go. Miners, take control of the local unions! Take the union into your own hands!

Pennsylvania and Ohio Miners: Hold fast in your brave fight! Mass picketing and mass violation of injunctions are absolutely necessary for winning the strike. The National "Save the Union" Conference will build up the utmost possible support to your heroic battle.

Miners of Illinois, Indiana, Kansas and the Southwest: You have been double-crossed by the Lewis policy of separate agreements. The operators have used this Lewis policy to weaken the Pennsylvania-Ohio strike, to cripple your own district organization and to worsen your working conditions. Strike April First! Insist upon a national settlement.

Miners of the Hard-coal District: The Lewis-Cappelini-Golden-Kennedy machine has sacrificed your interests by the arbitration and speed-up agreements, by the contractor system, and the terroristic regime in the union. Its grip on the union must be broken. Your interests are one with the interests of the bituminous miners.

Miners of the Unorganized Districts: Time and again you have been betrayed in the worst way by the Lewis machine. We know that you want to organize and to establish union conditions. The Colorado strike demonstrated that. The National "Save the Union" Conference will lay the basis to organize the unorganized districts.

PROGRAM OF ACTION

The National "Save the Union" Conference will take definite steps:

2. To mobilize the full forces of the miners—organized and unorganized—to win the Pennsylvania and Ohio strike.
3. To organize the great masses of unorganized miners and to weld them into one powerful union.
4. To advance the general program of "Save the Union" Committee: for a six-hour day and five-day week, for nationalization of the miners, for a labor party, for state insurance and relief of unemployment and for equal division of work, a national agreement for all coal miners, against arbitration and speed-up agreements, no wage cuts, for the Jacksonville scale, for an honest and aggressive leadership, the re-establishment of democracy in the union and abolition of company control.

Miners! Lewis and his whole machine must go! Take control of the union! Win the Pennsylvania and Ohio strike! Organize the unorganized! Build the union! Save the union from the reactionary officialdom and the coal operators!

Miners everywhere: Come to the National Conference of the "Save the Union Committee." If your local union does not elect delegates, then form groups to send representatives. Disregard all intimidation and ignore all rumors of postponement of the conference.

The National "Save the Union" Conference will put a halt to the offensive of the operators and will mark the beginning of a new period of growth and success for the miners' union.

Send all credentials to Room 405, 526 Federal St., Pittsburgh, Pa., and also requests for further information.

For the Save the Union Committee,

JOHN BROPHY,
PAT TOOHEY,
POWERS HAPGOOD,
526 Federal St., N. S., Pittsburgh.

Literature and Economics

By V. F. Calverton

[Because of the confusion due to moving THE COMMUNIST from Chicago to New York, the manuscript of this series was lost and publication had to be discontinued. It is now resumed and will be concluded in the next two issues.—EDITOR.]

CHAPTER IV.

BOURGEOIS LITERATURE

AS WE CONTINUE our study of literature, we shall find that literary conceptions do not alter until the positions of social classes are changed. In simple, the aristocratic conception of tragedy does not wane until the aristocracies weaken. The same process is repeated in the history of the literature of every European nation.

The new revolution that develops in the literature of the eighteenth century is the bourgeois trend.

Before discussing the bourgeois trend, however, let us note a few of its fluctuations prior to its ascendancy in the eighteenth century. Growing up as the psychology of Puritanism, the bourgeoisie had its first fling at supremacy during the days of the Commonwealth (1649-1660). Due to the increasing power of the bourgeoisie, the theatre had been closed as early as 1643, and during the brief hegemony of the Cromwellians, art was sterilized of sensuality and passion. The sex-motif was castrated from literature. Even when they exploited the stage as a medium for propaganda, the bourgeois dramatists contrived plays like *Lusty Juventus* which were dedicated to a denunciation of dancing, gambling and the other vices. With the restoration of the aristocracy in 1660, the reign of Charles II was necessarily marked by a return to the older technique and taste, and it was not until after the white revolution of 1688, when, with the Bill of Rights and the elevation of the House of Commons, the bourgeoisie again came into control of the state, that an enduring bourgeois trend in literature was created.

The coronation of William II and Mary in 1688 chalked a revolutionary change in English society. The dominance of the crown, the conquering decision of nobility, were ended. Royal control was eclipsed by the rise of the House of Commons. The Bill of Rights had effected a sudden change and sweeping *coup d'état*. One phase of the economic struggle between the aristocracy and

bourgeoisie was expeditiously concluded. Taxation was no longer a matter of royal caprice, but of social control. The bourgeoisie usurped the purse-strings, limited the royal income, and empowered the House of Commons with many of the rights and privileges which had formerly belonged to the House of Lords. Unlimited monarchy was transformed into constitutional monarchy, with a cabinet system which grew into an executive institution. With Walpole, the triumph of the cabinet system was complete. The theory of the "divine right of kings" was gone, impaled in an irrevocable past, and was superseded by the popular conception of a king appointed by the people, and answerable to the people.

RISE OF THE BOURGEOISIE

It was the economic change that society was gradually undergoing, of which the rise of the bourgeoisie and decline of the aristocracy were signal and unambiguous manifestations, that altered the countenance of the civilized world. Once the House of Commons controlled the exchequer, great financiers sprang up within the legislative body, Montagues and Walpoles became veritable dictators of finance, the jugglery of funds became a jealous science, and with this spread of wealth the mighty wars of the eighteenth century became possible. Notable progress in industry, in the establishment of new trades rather than in the advancement of old, characterized the reign of William and Mary. With these new developments it is not surprising, therefore, that, according to the statistics of Davenant, exports increased by startling strides. In 1688, the annual value of English exports was £2,006,374; in 1699, it was £6,788,166. In 1715, it was £7,379,409. Town populations multiplied with amazing swiftness. By creating new markets, and increasing transportation, these wars often caused industrial expansion. In addition, the foreign policy of William and Mary enhanced commerce and the way was clear for the development and exploitation of America and India. The Peace of Utrecht (1713) had furthered the advance of the bourgeoisie. Newfoundland had been secured, Nova Scotia, Hudson Bay Territory, Gibraltar and Minorca obtained, and the exclusive right to ship slaves to Spanish and American colonies fell to the British. Colonies were sought and controlled by the English government solely for their economic value. The manufacture of any goods which was also manufactured in England was drastically prohibited in its colonies. To protect this expanding commerce, a strong navy was an immediate necessity, and with the protection created by the spread of mercantile necessity, the sentiment of nationalism developed in hasty and ferocious form. The effect of this change was singularly conspicu-

ous in literature. The only playwright of the seventeenth century who had deliberately extolled patriotism was Roger Boyle; with the dominance of the bourgeoisie, eighteenth century drama becomes replete with patriotic prologue, epilogue, and plot. That the aristocracy resented the growth of this attitude is to be discovered in the works of all or many of those who represented the Tory cause; in *The Gentleman Cully* (1710), for example, we find Charles Johnson in the prologue declaring that the modern patriot is "a Creature of a strange, spiteful Heterogenous Nature. Love for his country, does his Breast Inspire, and warms it with a mercenary Fire."

BOURGEOIS CHARACTER IN LITERATURE

During feudalism, the bourgeoisie had been an undergroup, a submerged class. The merchant had belonged to a despised rank, the nobles scorned the merchant's birth; "ridiculed his manners, envied his wealth."¹ In Literature the bourgeois characters had been either ignored or contemned, often farcically footed in stultifying fashion. The aristocratic conception of tragedy had fettered full-blown freedom of characterization.

Flowing from this economic change of society, this growth of commerce and rise of the bourgeoisie, trade was becoming more reputable. The merchant became a more esteemed citizen. Burnet, in his *History of His Own Times*, declared of the mercant's class:

"It is the best Body in the Nation, generous, sober, and charitable. So, that while the People in the Country are so immersed in their affairs, that the sense of Religion cannot reach them, there is a Better Spirit stirring in our Cities; more knowledge, more zeal, and more charity, with a great deal more Devotion."

Old aristocratic families intermarried with rising bourgeois families for the sake of money. The bourgeoisie at the time of William and Mary, nevertheless, had attained control of the state to such a point that the prevailing social attitude became bourgeois instead of aristocratic.

The rise and success of bourgeois economics brought with them the development and intensification of bourgeois psychology and ethics. The nature of the life of the bourgeoisie necessitated strictness and rigidity of morals. The moral standards of the aristocracy were determined by the economic status of its class, the shibboleths of bourgeois morality by the economic status of that class. With the advance of the bourgeoisie in the last decade of the seventeenth century we discover a return to the same morality of the period of the Commonwealth, tempered by the social change of the intervening

¹ A Syllabus of American History. By James O Neal.

years and by the fact that the power of the bourgeoisie was now legalized and not the result of military usurpation. Extravagance became execrable, and thriftiness enthroned.

It was the *Sentimental Comedy* that first introduced the psychology of the bourgeoisie in direct, vivid, and undiluted style into the drama. The *Sentimental Comedy* crystallized the expression of a movement. It reveals a change in taste that flowed from a change in social relations.

The improvement in moral tone that the *Sentimental Comedy* marked, and which critics have discussed at length in style simple and sesquipedalian, was in reality not an improvement in moral tone, but an indication of change in social dominancy. The moral tone of the few puritan dramas had been more severe and astringent, more moral in the bourgeois sense of the word, than the moral tone of the comedies of Steele and Cibber. The "moral tone" of the *Sentimental Comedy*, then, was the "moral tone" of another social class, the bourgeoisie. Writers did not become more moral by any strange alchemic process, but through the effect of an economic transposition. Their work, the change in their attitude, reflected the nature of the economic and social change.

Steele in the drama and Addison in the essay were among the first to give literary satire to the spirit of the new commercial age. They did not write plays of essays about commerce, but in their attitude they voiced the sentiment of the commercial class. In *The Christian Hero* there was no question as to Steele's position. In this tract he had endeavored to persuade the educated men of this kingdom to accept the Bible as a moral counsellor. In the epilogue to *The Tender Husband*, he gave utterance to the sudden flood of patriotism that had seized the country, extolling in language unrestrained all things English—"and English be the language of all mankind." Cibber in the epilogue to *The Careless Husband*, was not less chauvinistic. Where the Restorationists, expressive of the aristocratic psychology, would have condemned habits of frugality and prudence, Steele, expressive of the bourgeois psychology, exalts them—"to live comfortably is to live with prudence and frugality."² In all of his plays he projected his good characters to the foreground, and relegated the bad to the rear. Virtue was rewarded with a caress and vice with castigation. Virtue must triumph—vice must be vanquished. In his preface to *The Conscious Lovers*, Steele had declared that "the chief design of this was to be an innocent performance, and the audience have abundantly shown how ready they are to support what is visibly intended that way," and further, he maintained that "anything that has its foundation in happiness and

² *The Tender Husband*. By Richard Steele.

success must be allowed to be the object of comedy; and sure it must be an improvement of it to introduce a joy too exquisite for laughter, that can have no spring in delight." Such were the bourgeois motifs that dominated the dramas of Steele and the school of *Sentimental Comedy*.

The ideology of the bourgeoisie thus had thrust itself into art. If the bourgeoisie had continued to be a submerged class, this development of an esthetic, this incursion of an art of its own, expressing its mentations and motives, would have been postponed until its submersion had disappeared. The Coffee Houses of the period were significant in affording the bourgeoisie a center of organization. They afforded a means of communicating ideas and ventilating opinions. In the universities, salons, and theatres such an opportunity was not to be discovered. In the Coffee Houses, at this time, however, the spirit of the age dwelt, and from the middle-class culture that developed in them emanated a standard of manners and habit that was to change a nation and create a world-philosophy.

THE CHANGE IN SOCIAL ATTITUDE

It should not be thought, however, that the bourgeoisie met with no opposition, that the Tories were submissively silent. The fall of the Whigs in the early part of the eighteenth century, a result of the tornado of excitement caused by the reprehension of Sacheverell, was sufficient proof that the strength of the landed class had not yet waned. Furthermore, the aristocracy in its intense struggle with the bourgeoisie, had curbed its extravagance, and, as with the court, had been forced to temper its morality into closer consonance with the spirit of the time. The days of royal ribaldry and aristocratic excess, as we stated in an earlier paragraph, had gained the contempt of court and citizen. The economic rise of the trading class, the bourgeoisie, and the economic decline of the landed class, the aristocracy, had brought about this change in social and moral attitudes. Although the moral attitudes of the two classes, for the time being, were less sharply disparate than in the generations previous, it should not be imagined that they converged. The antithetical rise and fall of the two classes had not removed the economic differences that separated them. The aristocracy, however, became more and more dependent upon the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie, as trade tripled and wealth leaped, became more and more independent of the aristocracy. The purse-strings were no longer within the jingling fingers of the wanton lord, but in the trust of "God's appointed" rulers—the bourgeoisie.

If we pass from poetry to philosophy, we shall find that one of the most momentous changes provoked by the rise of the bourgeoisie

was the revolutionary logic of John Locke. Locke, in brief, rose as the champion of the bourgeoisie. In 1680, Filmer's *Patriarcha*, in line with the Hobbesian dialectic, had lauded the monarchical tradition, with its aristocratic politics and "divine-right" metaphysic. Locke overthrew the entire basis of their logic. He shattered their pretensions at historical interpretations and constructed a new set of political analogies which rendered theirs absurd. Like Rousseau, whom he preceded by almost a century, he justified a new scheme of thought, elaborated a new psychology. For him the state of nature was no savage chaos, brutal and obliterating. For him men did not sign away their rights with a single contract, or determine their destiny with a single decision. No political manifesto or royal decree could rob the people of rights that were sacred and inalienable. Kings did not inherit their prerogatives from God but from the people. The land, created by nature, belonged to society and not to individuals. In his work *Civil Government* Locke had maintained that God had given the land as common property to all men. Land-possession, the character of government, the continuance of laws—all were subject to the will of the people.

In 1579, the cause of the French bourgeoisie had been set forth in a revolutionary tract often attributed to Hubert Languet, entitled *Vendiciae Contra Tyrannos*. Here, as later with Locke, the arguments presented in defense of popular sovereignty were bulwarked, in medieval style, by biblical authority. Locke, on the other hand, put his case in the form of callous logic. His work was a clear defense of the revolution of 1688, with the seizure of dominancy by the bourgeoisie. Both of his *Treatises of Government* are philosophic rationalizations of the cause of the merchant class. Locke defended representative government not because abstract logic led him to that point of view, but because the trend of social events, the conflict of social classes, the riot of social philosophies literally forced him to take that issue. Locke had been born a bourgeois, had returned to England after the success of the revolution, been made Commissioner of Appeals and later appointed to The Board of Trade. There was no other stand for him to take. He was not an aristocrat. He could not attack regicide, as had Hobbes in representing feudalism and the aristocracy: he could but defend it in representing commercialism and the bourgeoisie. He justified revolution and the right of the people to create it. Rousseau later in *The Social Contract* was to do the same for the French Bourgeoisie.

INFLUENCE ON THE DRAMA

It is in tragedy, however, that the sweeping influence of the bourgeoisie is revealed with even greater vigor and emphasis. While

several plays, one of Heywood's, one of Rowe's, one of Otway's, one of Southern's, had given insinuating expression to the bourgeois motif in tragedy, it was Lillo's play *The London Merchant*, which was staged by Theophilus Cibber in 1731, that actually broke the back of the aristocratic tradition in tragedy.

Feudal tragedy which had concerned itself only with the heroic and the aristocratic had been a removed, exalted thing. The passions of kings, the ambitions of princes, the dreams of fair ladies, had been all dealt with in an exclusive way, favorable to the ruling class. The under-classes had been treated with the contempt due their social rank. The theatre had but mirrored the social life of the time, expressed its caste-distinctions and class-psychology.

In 1703 Rowe in *The Fair Penitent* wrote:

"We ne'er can pity what we ne'er can share. . . .
Therefore an Humble theme our author chose
A melancholy Tale of Private Woes."

It was *The London Merchant*, nevertheless, which endowed this movement with definiteness and force. The town came to it with doubt and amusement, sneering at "the presumption of the author, in hoping to make them (the audience) sympathize in the sorrows of any man beneath the rank of an emperor, king or statesman."³ The play was a volcanic anomaly. It excited immediate attention, discussion, and controversy. Night after night, in the tense heat of midsummer, the drama drew eager and enchanted audiences. It moved and thrilled and overwhelmed. Queen Caroline sent for the play to read from the manuscript, and Pope, approaching with dubiety, left with enthusiasm. His praise was clear and candid. The drama went through five authorized editions in a few years. As years sped on, the leading actors and actresses of each generation played in *The London Merchant*, including such Thespian cynosures as Mrs. Siddons, Charles Kemble, and Sir Henry Irving. Since the whole world was going through a set of economic changes similar to those in England, only at a rate less rapid, the effect of the play was not confined to the insular appreciation of English readers and spectators. Rousseau in his *Lettre a d'Alembert*, favored it with outstanding praise. Diderot in *Entretiens sur la Fils Naturel* compared it to the enduring art of Sophocles and Euripides. In his *Poetique Francaise*, Marmontel placed it side by side with Racine's *chef d'oeuvre*. Prevost in *Le Pour et Contre* gave the play extensive consideration; Goethe and Schiller referred to it with esteem, and Lessing in *Miss Sara Simpson* had taken it as the model for his most striking drama. Not long after its stage presentation the

³ Biographica Dramatica.

drama cropped up in narrative literature. In three volumes dedicated to Mrs. Siddons, Thomas Skinner Surr told the tragedy of George Barnwell in the form of the novel. In 1810, fourteen years later, appeared *The Memoirs of George Barnwell, the Unhappy Subject of Lillo's celebrated Tragedy: derived from the most Authentic Sources, and intended for the Perusal and Instruction of the Rising Generation, by a Descendant of the Barnwell Family*. Not more than ten years later these *Memoirs* were condensed and published as *The Life and History of George Barnwell*.

Such, in brief, is the history of this one play. Its epoch-making character, in the face of these facts, cannot be denied.

THE BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION IN LITERATURE

But why was it so epoch-making: why did it cause so sharp a rupture in dramatic tradition? Because it signalized the intrusion of a new attitude, the crystallization of a bourgeois esthetic in the heart of an ancient institution. The same tendency to *moralize* which we have already noted in the poetry of Pope and the prose of Steele and Addison, was accentuated to a point of cloying excess in *The London Merchant*, *The Gamester*, and other plays of this school. The moral lesson in Lillo's play is a bourgeois moral lesson. It provides a tragic example to the youths of the bourgeoisie. It illustrates a class moral in obvious if vigorous fashion.

Where Pope and Steele had represented but *phases* of a class psychology, Lillo represented it in its entirety. In the works of Pope, Steele, and Addison the class-sentiment was more clandestine and subtle; in Lillo and Moore it was more open and obvious. The very diction of Lillo's play betrays this fact. The new tradesmen were not to be silenced by satire or imperfections of culture. They demanded, in a sense, expression in art. Lillo gave this expression. In the Restoration Age the bulk of the plays had been written by a dozen men; in the eighteenth century scores of one-play authors sprang into creation. Fully half of the plays of this era were penned by men unconnected with literature and unambitious of literary immortality. There were more than double the number of individual dramatists in this period that there had been in the period previous, and over four times as many anonymous plays were written. These new "unliterary" authors gave sudden and sharp impetus to the bourgeois drama. The comedy of manners, under this democratizing influence, lost its vivaciousness and brilliance. New motifs and new themes created new vistas of dramatic opportunity. The aristocratic was no longer fashionable. The virtues of the bourgeoisie became part of the prevailing culture. An ethic

and an esthetic peculiar to the bourgeoisie ripened into a creative and critical expression.

Thoroughgood, the London merchant, exemplified the English merchantry, voiced their sentiment, defined their attitude. The following quotation from the play will indicate in form more vivid than that of historical document or social description the psychology of the new order and its new ethic:

"You may learn how honest merchants, as such may sometimes contribute to the safety of their country, as they do at all times to its happiness; that if thereafter you should be tempted to any action that has the appearance of vice or meanness in it, upon scorn reject whatever is unworthy of it. As the name of merchant never degrades the gentleman, so by no means does it exclude him; only take heed not to purchase the character of complaisant at the expense of your sincerity."

In the time of Shakespeare, and also during the time of the Jacobeans, the merchant was scorned and mocked, his habits of life condemned, his asceticisms derided. The change is now complete. The merchant is extolled. His life is a source of emulation. His virtues are exalted, his vices obscured. Values have been inverted, transvaluated.

All through the eighteenth century, in the novels of Richardson, the critical homilies of Johnson, in the horticultural theories of Temple, Kent and Walpole, the bourgeois motif predominated. The social changes that had resulted from the spread of the commercial revolution and that were slowly leading to the industrial revolution, had established the bourgeoisie as the ruling class in society.

Literature did nothing more than reflect—and justify—this change.

(To be continued)

BOOKS

1928. "THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION AND THE WORKERS."

By JAY LOVESTONE.—Workers Library Publishers.—20 cents.

"What shall the workers do—especially the conscious and militant workers—in preparation for the 1928 Presidential Elections?"—asks comrade Lovestone in the opening paragraph of the pamphlet; and indeed with each passing day this question becomes more and more pressing for the American working masses.

The economic situation today—the growing unemployment, the lowering wage standard, the lengthening "breadlines" throughout the country, the enormous drop in farm production for the last 12 months all indicate the onrushing crisis. The political situation, the growth of American Imperialism, the choking off of strikes, and the war danger in the labor movement; the menace of injunctions, government strikebreaking, betrayal by the socialist party and the labor officialdom; the collapse of the labor banks, etc., clearly show the path for the conscious workers to follow.

Comrade Lovestone gives a graphic picture of the present situation in his pamphlet.

He traces the evolution of the political parties in America today, the various stages these parties have undergone, their composition past and present and their traditional background. Against the background and history of the existing political parties the possibilities of a Labor Party in America and a Labor ticket in 1928 are seen more clearly.

What are the issues in the 1928 elections? Are they the same for the workers as for the capitalists? Comrade Lovestone draws a clear line between the issues confronting the two classes.

The role the government plays in strikes, injunctions, farm relief, social insurance, etc., are some of the most important issues for workers in the 1928 elections. They must become the fighting slogans of the workers.

What shall be our attitude towards the Labor Party? This is a most important question, and the pamphlet gives a clear outline of possibilities and expectations in the 1928 election campaign. While realizing the effect the Labor Party will have upon the unification of the labor movement, we must not forget that only the Communist Party is capable of leading the American workers into militant action. Should it be impossible to launch a labor ticket—we must immediately turn the attention of the American workers towards our party.

Every worker should read this pamphlet. Every party unit must see that its members give this publication the widest possible circulation.

S. M.

"THE STORY OF MUSIC." By PAUL BEKKER.

Norton Publishing Co.—\$3.00.

Bekker's approach is materialistic. And the entire story of music is written in a charming style, mixed with philosophical analyses and conclusions. He traces the story from its beginnings in crude reproductions of the human voice to the refined symphonies of the nineteenth century. But he does not speak of that special development of music called jazz. Perhaps he does not do so because jazz is the reflection in music of decaying capitalism. I can see no other reason except snobbishness, which, in the final analysis, means the same.

In the introduction to the book, we discover that Bekker was "invited" to give a series of lectures to the Radio High School by the South-Western Radio Corporation of Germany. The lectures resulted in the book now in review.

The first chapter of the book reveals that Bekker does not believe that things develop. He says that "since the constructive forces always remain the same, since nothing can be added or lost, it follows that the total value of the result must remain the same result too. Only appearances change, so what takes place is a transformation" (not development—D. G.).

By the above, Bekker means the following: "Young men of the Radio High School, the constructive forces have always been the same and will always remain the same. The constructive forces allow you to grow to that degree where you will be able to serve your masters most competently. Beyond that point you cannot grow, for then you change the constructive forces; for then you realize it is historically inevitable for capitalism to be abolished by the working class, a proletarian dictatorship to be established which will duly give way to a Communist society. You are in the cage of capitalist constructive forces and you must remain in them, or become a revolutionary in trying to burst open its bars. May God prevent you from that! "That is the essence of Bekker's phrase. The young student will think: "How can we believe with the Communists in a new society when the constructive forces are always the same?"

Then Bekker unctuously states: "Only appearances change." Yes, capitalist society will always exist. Only it will assume different forms, *i. e.*, it will "transform," "metamorphose." Again we strike the subtle snag of bourgeois preaching. What is the nature and extent of these appearances, disappearances, and transformations (or metamorphoses, to use the author's favorite term borrowed from Goethe)? This is the nature of them: They are the changes in the capitalism of one country in its relation to the other capitalist countries. Or, it is the relation between the *capitalist class* forces of one country alone. In the changes of the alignments and re-alignments of *capitalist* classes of all nations (speaking of the present and last, imperialist, stage of capitalism) consists the appearances, disappearances and metamorphoses of historical phenomena.

We can safely glean and conclude the final point in the pretty veil of Herr Bekker's terminology. He is bound North, South, East and West by a capitalist ideology; he cannot get rid of it. His metamorphoses permit of no other changes but those of a capitalist nature and do not permit them to extend beyond the bounds of the same society. This is why he objects to and does not believe in "development."

Marx, in speaking of development, means the development of productive forces; the definite changes in the methods of production which determine a definite system of society in essence different from other forms. Therefore,

we speak of history as the *development* of one system of society into another. This change from one system into another necessitates (as our cautious Bekker perhaps perceived and therefore perhaps consciously perverted) a clash, revolution, between the existing forces and the forces desirous of existence. Revolution ushered in feudalism from the gates of slavery; capitalism from feudalism and the foundations of socialism from capitalism. For these reasons, Paul Bekker, employed by the South-Western Radio Corporation of Germany, must teach the young men of the Radio High School "metamorphosis," which means an abandonment of the class struggle, and not "development," which latter means adherence to the revolutionary principles of Marxism and Leninism.

With a knowledge of the above fundamental perversion the other minor inadequacies of the book can the easier be unveiled. And with such reservations, one may read the "Story of Music" with great pleasure. But in the reading one must be careful of accepting the cock-sure, unproven, bourgeois theories set forth by the author in very pretty phrasings.

DAVID GORDON.